DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 444 UD 013 942

AUTHOR	Eckstein, Max A.; Noah, Harold J.
TITLE	Metropolitanism and Education: Teachers and Schools in Amsterdam, London, Paris and New York.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Inst. of Philosophy and Politics of Education.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	51p.; Occasional Paper Number 1
AVAILABLE FROM	Inst. of Philosophy & Politics of Education, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., Box 211, New York, N.Y. 10027 (Price not quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Comparative Education; *Cross Cultural Studies; Educational Administration; *Metropolitan Areas; National Norms; School Organization; School Systems; Success Factors; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Militancy; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	Amsterdam; France; London; Netherlands; New York City; Paris; United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

The twin rationales for this study are: (1) that the educational implications of metropolitan conditions deserve further study; and (2) that these implications transcend national boundaries. The study focuses on two facets of metropolitan school systems located in four metropolises: the characteristics of teachers and the patterns of perceived success of the respective school systems. In an attempt to use some sub-national unit, this study considers selected elements of the educational systems of Amsterdam, London, Paris, and New York City. It is hypothesized that in both respects, the four cities not only differ from the norms of their respective national settings but they differ in the same direction from nation to nation. It is predicted that both metropolitan teachers and what is termed the perceived success of their school systems are marked by features peculiar to the metropolitan setting: its heterogeneity, mobility, concentration of expertise, and so on. The purpose of this study is, however, not limited to identifying similarities and differences within and across countries. Explanations of findings are suggested, by considering why certain differences between metropolitan and national norms are less marked in some countries than in others, and why the differences are sometimes in unexpected directions, or inconsistent. (Author/JM)

ED 085444

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

METROPOLITANISM AND EDUCATION: TEACHERS AND SCHOOLS IN AMSTERDAM, LONDON, PARIS AND NEW YORK

BY

MAX A. ECKSTEIN

HAROLD J. NOAH

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Inst. of Philosophy and Politics of Education, Teachers College
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

UD 013942

THE INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY
AND POLITICS OF EDUCATION
TEACHERS COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Occasional Paper Number 1

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Copyright 1973

The Institute of Philosophy
and Politics of Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Acknowledgements	ii
Chapters	
PART I	
1 Metropolitanism and Education.	1-3
2 Metropolitan School Systems: Structures and Problems.	4-15
PART II	
3 The Characteristics of Teachers.	16-23
4 The Perceived Success of Metropolitan School Systems	24-33
5 Conclusions.	34-37
Appendixes	
1 Metropolitan Stacistics.	38-39
2 A. Teacher Characteristics.	40-41
B. School Success Characteristics	42
3 Defining Comparative Education	43-45

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this study owe a considerable debt of gratitude to many people. Without their assistance, the work would have been poorer. However, none of those acknowledged below, nor those whose names have been inadvertently omitted, are in any way to be held accountable for the manner in which facts or ideas have been presented or interpreted. That is entirely the responsibility of the authors.

No progress in the work would have been possible without the encouragement and support of two organizations: the Institute of Philosophy and Politics of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, and The Ford Foundation. Special thanks are due to Professor Lawrence A. Cremin, Director of the Institute and to Mr. Edward J. Meade, Jr. of the Foundation.

The authors wish also to express thanks to the many persons who made available their knowledge and experience and their sources of information. They include:

in Amsterdam:

Dr. J. Bakker, Director, H. Bauman Pedagogical Academy
Mr. Sebastien J. C. van Eyndhoven, Pedagogisch-Didactisch Instituut, University of Amsterdam
Mr. Franke, Chief, Department of Personnel, City School System
Professor Dr. Ph. Idenburg, University of Amsterdam
Dr. J. Meerdink, Director, Municipal Bureau of Statistics
Mr. H. Redemeijer, General Association of Teachers (A.B.O.P.)
Mr. A. W. Wagner, City School Inspector
Dr. Egbert Warries, Research Instituut voor Toegepaste Psychologie
Dr. M. van Willigen, Bureau of Educational Research

in London:

Mr. Fred Jarvis, Deputy General Secretary, National Union of Teachers
Dr. A. N. Little, Director, Research and Statistics Group, I.L.E.A.
Mr. H. E. Naylor, Head, Department of Recruitment, Inner London Education Authority
Dr. Douglas A. Pidgeon, Deputy Director, National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales
Dr. John Westergaard, Center for Urban Studies, University College

in Paris:

Mlle. F. Bacher and M. Denis Bonora, Institut National d'Etude du Travail et d'Orientation Professionelle
M. J. Majault and R. Guillemoteau, Institut Pédagogique National
M. Dominique Merllié, Centre de Sociologie Européenne
M. Naudin, Service Central des Statistiques et Sondages
M. André Ouliac, Syndicat National des Instituteurs

in Stockholm:

Professor Dr. T. Husén, Dr. Neville Postlethwaite, and other members of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (the I.E.A. Project).

Dr. Richard M. Wolf, Teachers College, Columbia, assisted us in analyzing I.E.A. data.

Finally, we thank the following for giving us the opportunity of presenting to them some portions of this work while it was in progress: the officers and members of the Comparative Education Society of Europe at their Annual Conference in Stockholm, 1971; the officers and conferees of the UNESCO Institute for Education's conference on comparative methodology, Hamburg, 1971; our fellow-members of the Institute of Philosophy and Politics of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

PART I

CHAPTER I

METROPOLITANISM AND EDUCATION

This study grows out of two closely associated concerns. First, the growth of large cities and the problems that vex them are important to the interested parent or citizen, as well as to educational policy makers and planners. Second, the increasing typicality and commonality of the urban environment and the pervasiveness of the influence of large population centers in and beyond their own countries, makes this theme a natural subject for the use of comparative analytical methods. The first is a more pragmatic consideration, while the second may be more academic and theoretical. They are complementary, however, in that policy and practice both draw on and test theory.

The metropolis is a special form of the urban environment, an exceptionally large population concentration within a given country, whose influence is great nationally and extends beyond its national boundaries. In commerce, communications, and politics its importance is clearly recognized. As a center which attracts talent in varied fields, its significance is evident. It is characterised by social and economic heterogeneity, high levels of population mobility, and a disproportionate concentration of skilled manpower and economic activities of particular types. Of particular importance to the social, political, and economic influence which the metropolis radiates is the fact that it is here that the centers of communication and distribution of ideas are located.

However, as an educational force, the role of the metropolis has been neglected. It trains and produces people of all ages, through many kinds of formal and informal agencies. The importance of this process lies in the fact that there are special, even unique circumstances that characterize the metropolis, a pattern of social, economic, and political conditions which signify a special quality of existence. Inevitably, this must be bound up with education and with schooling. The twin rationales for this study are: 1. that the educational implications of metropolitan conditions deserve further study; and 2. that these educational implications transcend national boundaries.

The Metropolitan Phenomenon

Like schooling, the experience of living in a metropolitan setting is relatively new so far as most of the population of the world is concerned. True, schools and cities have existed for thousands of years. But in the twentieth century the two experiences, of formal education and of urban living, have become common to the majority of people in the developed world.

Industrialization and the growth of technology are marked by the growth of cities, the increase in formal schooling for all, and more specialized, advanced education for many. Through his growing technological knowledge, Man has been able both to ignore and to meddle with his natural environment. His artifact, the city, was a function of new inventions: social, political and economic. The metropolis is its latest manifestation, rapidly becoming the human settlement of the twentieth century. As their conditions of existence, needs and beliefs converge, the inhabitants of Amsterdam, London, Paris, New York, and other urban agglomerations come to form a global community transcending their national boundaries. No citizen in modern society can escape the influence of the metropolitan economy, communicational system or culture, even though he may not reside in the metropolis.

Whether physically or socially, the metropolitan environment is identifiable: an intricate transportation network, high concentration of residential, industrial, and cultural facilities. Flux is the theme of the metropolis: people are in constant movement, from home to work, in and out of buildings, vehicles, shops and places of entertainment. Streets are filled with people and objects in rapid motion, window displays and billboards are renewed constantly, and the physical environment is always undergoing change, demolition, rebuilding and refurbishing. People, too, are in transit, not only in the strictly physical sense. They change residence, employment, they sample new tastes and styles. Metropolitan areas generate their own peculiar forms of human interaction and their own political and economic systems.

Within the metropolis divergences between the various subgroups are striking: inner city and suburban residents, the urban poor and the propertied, salaried middle class are separated spatially and politically as well as by economic status. As the contrasts sharpen, polarization becomes a danger to the organic life of the metropolis and a refutation of its promise for a better life for the many.

The contrast between rich and poor, favored and disadvantaged, has long been characteristic of the city. In the modern metropolis, however, its sharpened form represents not merely a simple numerical increase but a difference in scale so great as to be qualitatively different. For it is accompanied by a host of other civic problems deriving directly from the rapid rate and size of growth of the metropolis. The mere presence of so many people overloads facilities for public transportation, housing, health, recreation and schooling, creating grave problems of pollution and congestion, to such an extent that the modern metropolis has been described as ungovernable.

As former patterns of behavior and life change radically, the accretion of such large human settlements presents social and educational problems of the first magnitude. Understanding of the new environment does not keep pace with the growth of either the metropolises, or their attendant problems. The field of metropolitan studies is in its infancy. In particular, how the phenomena of metropolitanism are related to the form and function of education remains especially obscure.

Much of the specifically educational writing about the metropolis is pragmatic. It emanates from concern with a current issue, such as racial integration, curriculum improvement, and administration and control of schools. It is concerned with coping with pressing emergencies. Prescriptions and normative descriptions prevail while an analytical, comprehensive view of the metropolis and metropolitan education is largely lacking.

Education in the Metropolis

If, as Plutarch said, the City is the teacher of man, then the modern metropolis can be regarded as the total learning environment. The child who grows up in the metropolis is educated in ways and content that are unique in human history and, certainly, not by virtue of his formal school experience alone. The metropolitan phenomenon constitutes a set of unprecedented conditions, generating a process of socialization that distinguishes metropolitan Man from all others.

There is a danger, of course, in asserting that metropolitan education is simply a function of growing up in the large city. Like the philosopher who states that all of life is education, we may be using a definition so comprehensive that it is useless. Similarly, there is danger in emphasizing the novel aspects of metropolitanism, for the historically-based recurrent aspects of the human condition may thereby be obscured. Nonetheless, the impact of this setting upon the people, young and old, who inhabit it, is so strong and so evident, that we feel justified in speaking of a "total metropolitan educational environment."

This environment contains, first, institutions entrusted with the formal task of daily instruction, primarily schools, colleges, and universities. To these is added a variety of school-system sponsored activities, both formal and informal. Next there are the activities of myriad non-school agencies: churches, philanthropic societies, youth organizations and interest groups concerned with conveying messages and skills of many kinds to the young and adult populations.

The cultural facilities of the metropolis, libraries, museums, theaters, concert halls, also fulfill educational functions. And there are other locales, too, which enrich the metropolitan educational environment; the park, the playground, the apartment house or street block, the corner candystore, all are educational settings, as is the very physical environment which strikes the senses and shapes the sensibilities of the city-dweller. And finally, there are the media through which information and ideas are disseminated: words, visual and oral, and pictures, in books and periodicals, on radio and television, in cinemas and posters -- all are part of the total educational environment of the metropolis.

One important theme of recent research has been, what type of institution and operation is most appropriate to the metropolitan situation? The modus operandi of our schooling, it has been argued, is a function of a former social system (rural, stable, characterized by little geographical or social mobility, for example); it still operates as if former conditions persisted. Thus, it is argued, contemporary problems arise from the persistence of the traditional model in a technological, mobile metropolis.

How to remedy the disjunction between schooling and the metropolitan environment is an urgent matter. In New York City, for example, innumerable proposals and experiments have addressed themselves to the problems of the big city school system. They have been directed at administrative reorganization in order to change the basis of policy and decision-making and the day-to-day direction of the schools, new ways of selecting and preparing teachers and ancillary personnel, and a reappraisal of traditional instructional methods and curriculum practices. All of these are the schools' responses to characteristic conditions of New York: urban congestion, the flight to the suburbs that produces inner-city blight, ghettoization, civil disorder, rising costs, wide-spread poverty and limited economic opportunity within the inner city aggravated by racial hostility. All testify to the growing inability of the city's agencies to cope with the maintenance, let alone the improvement, of basic services such as welfare (including education), communications and police. The story is the same wherever there is comparable growth: metropolitanization produces pressures to which the educational system is forced to respond. If then the metropolitan setting and style of life are increasingly characteristic, if the quality of education is at once a factor of this

trend and affected by it, then education must be seen as part of the web of interrelationships linking the social, political and economic factors in the metropolis.

Not only have other metropolitan centers in the United States been faced with similar pressures and issues, but so too have metropolitan centers in other parts of the world. London, notably, has reorganized its administrative structure and is grappling with problems raised by characteristic features of the metropolitan setting: population density, growth in the size of the school system, and racial and socio-economic heterogeneity, polarized into homogeneous neighborhoods. Clearly the experience of big cities in general and their school systems may provide guidance for any particular city to help clarify its problems, suggest alternatives and project possible outcomes of specific measures. Thus, the comparative dimension offers great potential. Strangely enough, any systematic comparisons which would make such help available do not yet appear to exist. Planners, whether in education or in other areas, who draw attention to foreign examples may provoke interest, but are hard put to persuade their clients that a foreign example has any real meaning for the native. Yet the big cities of the world do in fact provide a species of laboratory for the researcher, and systematic comparison should reveal the common dimensions and problems of metropolitanization, the alternative responses to these developments, and also some evidences as to their outcomes.

The Present Study: Scope and Rationale

Comparative education has for a long time been characterized by descriptive, mainly historical accounts and normative studies of education and other national institutions. They have provided disappointingly little help either for the researcher in understanding the dynamics of the system he wishes to explain, or for the educational policy maker who wishes to improve on what exists. One reason for this, we submit, is that the units for comparison have usually been entire nation states, thus obscuring important differences within countries.

In an attempt to use some sub-national units, this study considers selected elements of the educational systems of four large cities: Amsterdam, London, Paris, and New York. London and Paris are the capital cities of their nations: Amsterdam and New York are not. But all four are old-established centers of commerce, communications and political power, and each contains its country's largest concentration of population. All are, of course, examples of Western civilization and any conclusions we reach on the basis of our investigation will be correspondingly limited.

Ideally, our working definition of metropolis would be a large population concentration, comprising both city proper and its suburban extensions. Though we are interested in the functional whole, a cultural rather than a geographical area, in fact we are limited by existing definitions, largely administrative, for these are the categories in which the data for this study have been collected. London has revised its traditional and outdated administrative boundaries, and has moved to a regional framework; Paris is moving in this direction; New York and Amsterdam have so far not done so. Consequently, we have been forced to make do with what exists: the Inner London Educational Authority and Greater London; the Académie de Paris and the Département of the Seine; Amsterdam; and New York City.

We have elected to study two facets of metropolitan school systems located in four metropolises: the characteristics of teachers and the patterns of perceived success of the respective school systems. We hypothesize that in both respects, the four cities not only differ from the norms of their respective national settings, but they differ in the same direction from nation to nation. We predict that both metropolitan teachers and what we have termed the perceived success of their school systems are marked by features peculiar to the metropolitan setting: its heterogeneity, mobility, concentration of expertise, and so on. In Chapters 3 and 4, these expectations, their rationales, data and analyses are presented and discussed.

The purpose of this study is, however, not limited merely to identifying similarities and differences within and across countries. We try to extend it to explanations of what we find, by considering why certain differences between metropolitan and national norms are less marked in some countries than in others, and why, the differences are sometimes in unexpected directions, or inconsistent. Some of these problems will be taken up in Chapter 5.

As an introduction to the several cases, the next chapter sketches the main features of the four metropolitan educational systems and sets them briefly in their respective national contexts.

CHAPTER 2

METROPOLITAN SCHOOL SYSTEMS: STRUCTURES AND PROBLEMS

School Structures in National Context

The second chapter of this study describes schooling in the four metropolises both with reference to their respective national settings and in comparison with one another. Brief sections on the administration and organization of the public schools in each city draw attention to selected characteristics of the national educational system and to some of the basic facts about the size and organization of the metropolitan school structures. Next follows a brief profile of the educational scene in each city, describing the trends, issues, and general educational problems of concern to policy makers and schoolmen at the present time.

Amsterdam

Two types of school systems operate side by side in the Netherlands: public, administered by the municipalities (local authorities) or by the State (national authority), and private, run by denominational or other groups. However, both public and private schools are financed by the Government at the same level. The majority of public schools are operated by municipalities and provide for about 30 per cent of the nation's primary and secondary pupils. Most of the private schools are run by either the Roman Catholic or the Protestant (Dutch Reformed) Church and cater to approximately half the remaining pupils, respectively. While the Minister of Education and Sciences is responsible for educational legislation and for the enforcement of educational laws, three main parallel school systems exist, each subject to the same general laws, each supported by public funds, but each operating independently.

School administration in Amsterdam is patterned after the national model. The municipality operates general (secular) primary schools for about 52 per cent of the children; Protestant and Catholic systems account for 20 and 24 per cent respectively, while Jewish and other private (secular) schools serve the remaining 3 per cent of the primary school population. At the secondary level of schooling, approximately 44 per cent of pupils attend secular schools, while Protestant and Catholic systems account for about 24 and 26 per cent respectively of those in attendance.[1] The school population of Amsterdam as a whole (excluding pre-schooling, special education and certain trade schools), comprises over 70 thousand pupils in primary schools, 13.4 thousand in secondary schools (and over 11 thousand registered as students at the University of Amsterdam).

London

While the national ministry, the Department of Education and Science, has the duty "to promote the education of the people of England and Wales and the progressive development of institutions devoted to that purpose," it is left to the Local Education Authorities (162 in number) to fulfill the responsibility of actually providing primary, secondary, and further education in England and Wales. These authorities plan and implement the arrangements for schooling in their areas, subject to the approval of the Department, which provides about 60 per cent of local revenues for education.

As a unit of local government and as a Local Education Authority, London has for a long time held a somewhat special status, both because of its size and as the nation's capital. It still retains this unique character even though recent legislation has quite radically changed the way in which the London metropolitan region is governed. Since 1965, a two-tier local government organization has administered the London region with the Greater London Council delegating certain responsibilities to second-level bodies within it.

In the case of education, the Inner London Education Authority is responsible for the school service formerly provided by the London County Council. The boundaries of the area covered by the ILEA are substantially the same as those of the former LCC and comprise the twelve Inner London Boroughs and the City of London. The ILEA is a special committee of the GLC and is virtually autonomous, working closely with the GLC rather than subordinate to it. The surrounding suburban areas, which were formerly separate local authorities, now number twenty borough councils under the umbrella of the GLC.

---

[1] Jaarboek 1970. Amsterdam, Bureau of Statistics, 1970. Figures are for 1968.

In Inner London, general policy is determined by the ILEA Education Committee composed of the fifty-three members of the ILEA together with nineteen other persons chosen for their experience with education and their familiarity with the needs of schools and other educational facilities in London. A noteworthy feature of the Committee's composition is that it includes three teachers currently serving with the Authority. Four main sub-committees carry out the detailed work of the ILEA Education Committee: finance, staff and general, further and higher education, and schools.

Together, the schools in the ILEA accommodate over 400,000 pupils (nursery, primary, and secondary schools).[2] Nearly three-quarters of the pupils are enrolled in schools run directly by the Authority; the remainder are in voluntary schools, that is, schools supervised and supported financially by the ILEA but maintaining a denominational or other affiliation. About 10 per cent of these pupils are in Church of England and 13 per cent in Roman Catholic voluntary schools.[3]

The education service is administered by the Education Officer and his department, organized into administrative branches, divisional offices (one for each of the ten divisions into which the Authority is divided), and an inspectorate. The ILEA appoints its own staff but has a common policy with the GLC for the recruitment and promotion of administrative and clerical staff. By arrangement, the ILEA uses departments of the GLC for architectural engineering, legal, valuation, supplies, and financial services.

The ILEA projects its expenditures and informs the GLC how much should be raised by precepts on the rating (local taxing) authorities in Inner London and how much by borrowing. The making of precepts and the actual raising of the loans is undertaken by the GLC. Revenues for education derive from two main sources: the national Government (54 per cent) and local property taxes (37 per cent), about 9 per cent coming from public loans.

Paris

Since Napoleonic days, education in France has been directed by the central Ministry through regional and local administrative units. Until recently, all education was divided into three parts: primary, secondary, and technical schooling. Thus, the secondary schools, administered at the level of the twenty-three académies, were separated from the primary schools, administered at the département level. Recent reforms, however, have been directing at integrating these sectors, as part of the broader policy of increasing the opportunities for and reducing the obstacles to advancement up the educational ladder. Since 1959, the Ministry of Education has undergone a series of reorganizations in which new directorates (such as school administration and teaching) have been given responsibilities cutting across the previously separate sectors of schooling. A new post, that of secretary-general, was created to co-ordinate the work of the several divisions, with budget, finance, and school planning agencies attached to his office. Such reorganization has resulted, according to some observers, in a relative decrease in the dependent status of local school administrations.[4]

The status of Paris as the center of metropolitan France has also been changing in recent years, due to the attempt to reorganize its administration to conform to the realities of regional expansion around the capital city. A regional government has been established concerned with planning. Overall educational policy, however, remains centralized in the Ministry and school administration continues to be carried on through somewhat redefined regional and département offices. In the Paris académie only, a Director-General of education has been appointed, directly subordinate to the Minister, who combines the roles of Rector of the Académie (in charge of secondary education) and Inspector of the Département, formerly the Département of the Seine, (responsible for primary education). This consolidation of normally separate branches is justified by the special circumstances of Paris, in which a large number of lycées with national significance are concentrated. The Director-General also administers the educational provisions of the City of Paris. Hence, national, académie/département, and local administrative operations in Paris and the Seine are consolidated in education.[5]

There are about one-third of a million pupils in the public schools of Paris proper (including pre-schooling, primary, and secondary levels), some 75 per cent of all pupils in the city. The remainder attend private, generally Roman Catholic schools, which are, however, heavily subsidized by public funds. Public schools in the Paris region contain a larger percentage of all pupils, 87 per cent, numbering about 1.9 million.[6]

---

[2]The Greater London area serves over one million pupils.

[3]Direct grant and Independent schools are not included here. This would add an estimated 40,000 pupils to the total.

[4]See Annemarie Hauck Walsh, Urban Government for the Paris Region. New York: Praeger, 1968. Pp. 33 and 171.

[5]Walsh, pp. 173-4.

[6]Students registered at the University of Paris number about 150,000, nearly one-third of all university students in France.

New York

Public education in the United States is constitutionally the responsibility of the several States. Only recently has the Federal Government provided more than a minute proportion of the money for public schooling, though it has attempted to exert influence upon school policy and practice at different times. About 90 per cent of primary and secondary school pupils attend public schools in the United States, the remainder attending private institutions, mostly denominational (Roman Catholic) schools. The private schools are independent and subject to minimal public supervision. They receive indirect tax benefits, and only recently have begun to receive some small direct financial assistance from public sources.

Within the State of New York, as in most other States, decentralization to local community Boards of Education is the rule. These Boards bear the major responsibility for planning, implementing, and financing the school systems for their own districts. The State authority, however, provides financing and supervision of policy and practice to various degrees.

The Boards of Education of the larger cities in the State, including New York, may have a somewhat special status. In the case of New York City, the State legislature in 1969 approved a partly decentralized system for the regulation of public education, creating an embryonic second tier of administrative authority within the City's Board of Education. New York's Central Board of Education, formerly an appointed body entirely, now comprises seven members, one elected from each of the five Boroughs in the City, and two appointed by the Mayor. The Chancellor (formerly, the Superintendent of Schools) is the chief executive officer of the City school system, responsible for implementing the Board's policies within the framework of State laws and administering all programs not specifically vested in the local community boards. The Central Board retains direct responsibility for the provision of high schools, the credentialing of professional staff, their contracts of employment and the capital budget of the City school system. In contrast, the newly established community boards (31 in number) are composed of elected members. They are responsible for the provision of elementary and intermediate schooling in their respective districts (from pre-schooling through grades 8 or 9) and have powers over curriculum and staffing policy.

The public schools of New York City contain about 1.1 million pupils at all levels, some 70 per cent of all the pupils attending schools. The remainder attend private schools (78 per cent Roman Catholic, 11 per cent Jewish, the remainder other denominational or secular private schools). To finance the public schools, the Central Board submits an annual budget to the City Council of the City of New York, which determines the budget for all city expenditures. Total expenditures for education for 1969-70 were over $1435 million; city funds, largely local taxation, provided over half the revenue, and State monies about 40 per cent. Federal sources provided about 6 to 7 per cent.

Comparison

This review of the major structural features of four metropolitan school systems in their national contexts shows that major differences among them exist. Comparison is possible in terms of size, the relation between denominational and other schooling, the relation between the local educational authority and regional or national authority in financial matters.

Of the school systems reviewed, the largest is that of New York with over a million pupils in public schools and the smallest, Amsterdam with about ninety thousand pupils in secular and denominational schools. They differ, both ideologically and organizationally, in the extent to which denominational schools are supported and/or are supervised by the public authorities. In Amsterdam most evidently, and in London to a considerable degree, church affiliated schools (largely Protestant and Roman Catholic) are important parts of the whole system of schooling. In New York, religious (and secular private) schools are outside the public system of schooling, even though they enroll a pupil population of over a third of a million.

A third dimension along which the four cities may be compared is the administrative. Both London and New York have relatively autonomous local authorities running their school systems, as compared with those of Paris and Amsterdam which are integrated at many points into a more centralized national school systems. However, this refers to the formal administrative structures only and not to the functional autonomy of each system.[7] An additional aspect, that has become a general issue in each city and is most important for the operation of school systems, must be mentioned here: the need to consider the overall reorganization of big-city governments. London has moved to a two-tier metropolitan governmental system, Paris is moving toward a regional system, New York has begun to decentralize school administration within the City, Amsterdam has only been considering the possibilities of regional organization.

---

[7] We are unable at this point to estimate, for example, the actual freedom of New York City in relation to State and Federal authority, in comparison to Inner London's freedom in relation to Greater London and the national Department of Education and Science.

Educational Trends and Problems in Comparative Perspective

Description of the organization, administration, and size of a large city's school system provides only part of the total picture. Another dimension is added by considering the general educational issues and problems which concern policy makers and schoolmen in each of the cities in this study. These, of course, arise from local conditions. But it will quickly become evident that they are not peculiar to any single location. All four cities have the problem of managing a large-scale school system, of maintaining some uniform policy efficiently and economically, while at the same time encouraging a necessary diversity and responsiveness to changing needs. All the systems have to deal with the sub-groups and vested interests that often conflict on particular issues. They must cope with the rapidly changing demography and geography of the metropolis while attending to the daily tasks of instruction. The school system, like transportation, sanitation, law, and other public utilities, has to contend with problems which are a direct function of the number, density, and composition of the metropolitan population and its several styles of life.

Amsterdam

Of the major cities in this study, Amsterdam is by far the smallest. While not the capital of its nation, Amsterdam is the largest single city, an important center of trade, communcations, and political influence. It is in friendly rivalry with Rotterdam, a city that has by now moved far along the road toward regional organization of metropolitan facilities. Amsterdam represents the older, more staid administrative unit, proud of its history and not forced by wholesale wartime destruction into radical physical planning, as was Rotterdam.

Notwithstanding its small scale, overcrowding is the one problem which exercises all the inhabitants of Amsterdam. The city is congested, housing is in short supply, and schools are crowded. Primary schools tend to be relatively small; but average class size is considered to be still too large, even though it has been considerably reduced in recent years. An improvement in the supply of teachers and a reduction in the number of pupils have both contributed to this easement.

While the shortage of teachers of some years ago has been eased by an increase in the number of graduates from training institutions, some problems of staffing continue. Nearly half the primary teachers in Amsterdam are under twenty-nine years of age, and the proportion has been gradually rising. The relatively high rate of teacher turnover is a matter of concern. Beginning teachers typically move out after a few years. As they marry and have children, they seek more spacious and cheaper housing which they can find only outside Amsterdam. In this way, too, they escape the congestion and pollution of the city and, not least important, the concentration in the city of models of behavior considered detrimental for the young: prostitution, sex shops, and high levels of crime against persons and property.

Apart from youthfulness and high mobility, there is an associated problem of the quality of teachers and, in particular, their capacities to handle the school problems of the particular pupils they have to deal with. Two general phenomena have caused this to become a major concern: first, the national trend to reform. This movement is aimed at closer articulation between primary and secondary schooling, at increasing both options and opportunity at the secondary and more advanced levels, and at reducing the traditional dominance of academic (and, therefore, social) selectivity as an operating principle. Secondly, the growth of cities, population mobility, and urban renewal have made ever more visible the cycle of economic deprivation, social exclusion, and poor school performance which marks particular subgroups in society. Together, these two general phenomena have resulted in various attempts to reorganize the national structure of schooling, to modernize curricula and instructional methods, and to reorder teacher training. These are especially evident in the city of Amsterdam.

In this connection, the municipality provides extra assistance to schools in deprived neighborhoods in order to increase the number of teachers and to provide new and additional teaching materials. Teachers are encouraged to depart from the conventional, uniform textbooks and to develop materials more appropriate to the children and the communities in which they live. There is a noticeable move towards less structured and traditional approaches at various places. The ideas of the open classroom, individualized teaching, and integrated instruction are being disseminated, and in-service teacher courses are devoted to such subjects as the Nuffield mathematics and activity methods.

Support for innovation comes from several agencies. Though limited in its resources, an office of instructional services seeks practical ways to build upon this atmosphere of reform. Through professional meetings, formal and informal conferences, and study groups, and in collaboration with the educational research institute attached to the University of Amsterdam, efforts are made to define and provide the necessary services to deal with the associated problems of school and home. In the village, it was observed, the school and the home are physically and culturally close; but in the city, they are separated not merely by distance, but by the intervention of many other forces. What is needed, and a beginning is just being made, is social insight and specially trained personnel to make the connections between children at school and in their homes. At the same time, teachers are required to develop new sociopsychological understanding and pedagogical skills. One major research institution is conducting a demonstration action-research project in three primary schools in which considerable resources will be invested

to reorder the schoolhouse from top to bottom. Another important project involves longitudinal study of a large sample of primary school children from different social backgrounds in order to examine the relationships among school, community, and pedagogical factors.

At the national policy making level, the move to introduce a new law which would unify primary and kindergarten schools may be regarded as recognition of the crucial significance of early educational experience for all, but especially for the young, in economically and culturally deprived circumstances. It also points to the need to articulate such experiences with the subsequent phases of the school system. In the city of Amsterdam, with its established educational and cultural riches, big-city pressures combine to force re-examination and change in longstanding patterns of educational practice.

London

In spite of its larger scale and sprawling dimensions, London presents a set of educational issues remarkably similar to that of Amsterdam: crowding, mobility of teachers and pupils, and the difficulties facing teachers (and the school system generally) in dealing with the problems of the poor and the socially excluded.

Like other local authorities in England, the Inner London Education Authority has traditionally had considerable autonomy, though unlike many it has also long enjoyed a liberal and progressive reputation. Because it governs schools for over four hundred thousand pupils, the ILEA maintains a large bureaucracy, yet it has encouraged innovation and been tolerant of diversity. Furthermore, it has been sensitive to those social and economic differences within the city that impose special problems on the schools. The ILEA was in the vanguard in developing comprehensive secondary schools and an extensive system of evening programs for further education. In spite of all its efforts, though, London is today more seriously concerned than ever before about the effectiveness of its teachers and their capacity to meet the needs of London's pupils.

The supply of teachers was so inadequate some years ago that a rationing system was devised to distribute fully qualified personnel fairly among London's school districts. The situation appears to have eased, and the quota system now serves to set minimum standards. The shortage, however, has not entirely abated. Primary classrooms are still too crowded. The turnover of teachers is extensive, and a large proportion of the teaching cadre is young and inexperienced. The mobility of teachers is a serious matter for, as in Amsterdam, well-qualified young teachers are attracted to London and have little difficulty in obtaining posts. However, many do not stay very long. Industry lures away the scientifically trained with higher salaries, and young teachers irrespective of subject or level of instruction are attracted to the suburbs as soon as they begin to raise their families. An additional salary increment for teaching in the metropolis (the London allowance) does not compensate for the higher cost of living, especially housing, in London.

Intra-city mobility of teachers is also considerable, but in this teachers are no different from other workers. The entire population of the metropolis is highly mobile because of changing expectations and patterns of employment, housing shortages, and upheaval due to urban redevelopment on a large scale. London, too, is a magnet for people from all over the British Isles and abroad, and immigration is itself a stimulus to more mobility within the city and from it. Neighborhoods changing under the influx of East and West Indian migrants are a prominent part of the London scene. Thus pupils, as well as teachers, within the ILEA are highly mobile. While London retains its reputation and drawing power owing to its wealth and variety of educational institutions, it no longer prides itself on consistently high standards in public education. Standardized achievement testing in the primary schools has shown a decline in pupil performance on the average, and a high correlation between achievement and socioeconomic background of pupils and of schools.

It is in large cities that social and economic conditions most dramatically and oppressively combine to inhibit effective schooling. The poor and the immigrant embody a set of society's unsolved problems, and the schools, in England as elsewhere, are expected to spearhead efforts to ameliorate them. About 15 per cent of the children in the public schools of Inner London are immigrants themselves or children of recent immigrants. In two districts, Hackney and Islington, they comprised over 23 per cent of total enrollment and in some schools an even larger proportion (see Table 2.1).

Compensatory efforts ("positive discrimination," as it was called in the Plowden Report on primary schooling) have grown and will no doubt continue. Extra money, staffing, materials, and services are provided and new projects are common. In each London district teacher centers are being established with strong support from the administration to provide instructional resources, a center for discussion and debate, and a place for in-service study. But significant changes take time to mature and, in the meantime, the problems increase in size and seriousness.

TABLE 2.1

A. IMMIGRANT PUPILS[8] BY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN: ENGLAND, JANUARY 1968

	ILEA		Greater London		Rest of England and Wales	
	No. (1)	% (2)	No. (5)	% (6)	No. (7)	% (8)
Pupils from						
Africa	3,446	5.7	6,197	5.7	1,780	1.9
Cyprus (Greek)	5,461	9.0	9,328	8.6	738	0.8
Cyprus (Turkish)	2,987	4.9	4,206	3.9	128	0.1
India	3,967	6.5	14,682	13.5	27,758	30.1
Italy	2,269	3.7	3,529	3.3	8,029	8.7
Malta	585	1.0	807	0.7	264	0.3
Pakistan	1,944	3.2	4,637	4.3	12,326	13.4
Poland	556	0.9	1,152	1.1	1,435	1.6
Spain	951	1.6	1,243	1.1	283	0.3
West Indian	34,271	56.0	54,669	50.3	35,319	38.3
Others	4,548	7.5	8,116	7.5	4,116	4.5
Total Immigrant Pupils in schools with 10 or more immigrant pupils	60,985	100.0	108,566	100.0	92,176	100.0
Immigrant pupils as a percentage of all pupils in maintained schools with 10 or more immigrant pupils	--	18.1	--	16.5	--	12.1

Source: Greater London Council, 1968: Annual Abstract of Greater London Statistics. London: GLC, 1969. Page 140

[8]Definition of immigrant children: (1) Children born outside the British Isles who have come to this country with, or to join, parents or guardians whose countries of origin were abroad. (2) Children born in the UK to parents whose countries of origin were abroad and who came to the UK on or after 1 January 1958. Children of mixed immigrant and non-immigrant parentage and children from Northern Ireland or Eire are excluded.

TABLE 2.1 (Cont'd.)

B. DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANT PUPILS: INNER LONDON BOROUGHS

	All Pupils	All Immigrants	%
City of London	264	8	3.0
Camden	22,080	3,863	17.5
Greenwich	36,775	1,529	4.2
Hackney	34,889	8,086	23.2
Hammersmith	24,831	4,009	16.1
Islington	33,508	7,815	23.4
Kensington and Chelsea	16,992	3,042	17.9
Lambeth	45,069	8,964	19.9
Lewisham	41,537	5,127	12.3
Southwark	47,119	5,991	12.7
Tower Hamlets	31,286	2,920	9.3
Wandsworth	44,892	6,791	15.1
Westminster, City of	21,411	3,654	17.1

Source: Greater London Council, 1968: Annual Abstract of Greater London Statistics. London: GLC, 1969. Page 140.

C. IMMIGRANT PUPILS AS A PERCENTAGE OF ALL PUPILS

	No. of Immigrants	% of All Pupils in Maintained Schools
ILEA	61,799	15.4
GLC	112,100	10.6
Rest of England/Wales	108,112	1.7

Source: Greater London Council, 1968: Annual Abstract of Greater London Statistics. London: GLC, 1969. Page 140.

Paris

Because of the highly centralized nature of French education, such matters as teacher training and qualifications, staffing policy, curricula, pupil requirements at given levels, and types of schooling are standard throughout the nation. At first glance, therefore, school matters should be no different in Paris from other parts of the nation. However, as a result of its long history of political, economic, and cultural dominance in France (and throughout Europe), Paris is especially rich in educational institutions at the more advanced level (that is, universities and lycées). In addition, the obdurate facts of metropolitan change affect the educational scene. Migrants from other parts of the nation have swelled the population of Paris; immigrants from other parts of the world, notably North Africa and Indochina, have further added to it. The familiar centrifugal movement which characterizes large population centers has also developed so that the suburbs have sprawled and become more densely populated while the center of the city has declined in residential population. In Paris, as in the other metropolitan areas we study, an abundance of educational and cultural riches coexists with the social conditions that create special school problems, concentrated ethnic neighborhoods, high rates of population mobility, and the increasingly visible sub-cultures of the poor and the immigrant.

Social and educational policy in France is directed, as in other European countries, at modernizing public education along the lines of providing greater opportunity and more alternative routes for advancement up the educational ladder. In Paris, school problems tend to be handled as part of the general national effort to rejuvenate the school system and not as a response to a set of particular metropolitan problems. True, the overconcentration of people and institutions in and around Paris is a matter of grave concern to administrators and social planners. The movement toward a metropolitan government for the Greater Paris Region is seen as a major step in dealing with such overconcentration. Within a wider planning and administrative authority, it is believed, not only urban renewal, housing relocation, some decentralization of industry and commerce, and modernization of communications can be worked out, but also a redistribution of the geographical balance of educational institutions. The decentralization of the University of Paris is probably the most notable example of the attempt to do this. The counterpart to the regionalization of Paris is the strengthening and enrichment of education and schooling in provincial France, in smaller towns and in rural areas alike. Hence, for some time to come, both the effort and the effects of social reform policy are likely to be more visible outside of Paris than within.

New York

The list of issues and problems in education in New York may not be longer than in other large cities, but it is certainly written in larger characters. One group of unresolved problems is centered on the management and financing of the City's school system and in recent years has been bound up with attempts to decentralize the central Board of Education, an effort shot through with political and ethnic tensions as well as unresolved conflicts between local and central boards.

Another set of problems has to do with teachers, teaching methods, and the curriculum of the schools. While the shortage of teachers has eased, public dissatisfaction with their capacity to do an adequate job has continued. Innovative practices and special programs of a compensatory nature, heavily subsidized by Federal, State, and private funds, have all been attempted. Such well-publicized programs as Headstart, More Effective Schools, and Project Discovery, and a host of smaller but noteworthy efforts have each had their successes. But their effectiveness in ameliorating school conditions at large is questionable, for the environmental conditions associated with educational problems are more marked in New York than elsewhere. Most notably, they include the results of massive migration over three decades from the rural South, Puerto Rico, and the deprived areas of other urban centers in the United States. Blacks and Puerto Ricans are a majority in the public schools of New York, accounting for 33.6 per cent and 22.2 per cent respectively of the City's total school register.[9] Given the linguistic problems of migrants, whether from non-English speaking backgrounds or from the rural South, and the cultural problems of integration, it is small wonder that schooling in the inner city is a leading obsession of all connected with public policy and education, indeed with the public at large. The quality of schooling generally and the success of schools in maintaining adequate levels of achievement are both seen to be deteriorating. While local issues (changes in school administration and levels of policy making) are important, they are embedded in a national context of social and political tensions. Student demonstrations, random violence, and vandalism are so common that schools and teachers are demanding an increase in routine police protection. Not for the first time in the history of the United States, the schools are a microcosm of local and national strife and tension--ideological, political, economic, and social.

Notwithstanding all the dissension, disorder, and even decay of the City school system, the shortages in qualified teaching staff of several years ago have been eased. Two factors probably account for the City's ability to find teachers: a relatively high pay scale with generous fringe

---

[9]See Table 2.2. Official statistics give the Black community about 15 per cent of the City's total population. This fraction is probably an underestimate. For the extent to which Blacks and Puerto Ricans are concentrated in the boroughs of New York City, see Table 2.3.

TABLE 2.2

ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF SCHOOL REGISTER, NEW YORK CITY

Number of Pupils

	Negroes	American Indians	Orientals	Puerto Ricans	Other Spanish Surnamed Americans	Others	Total
Elementary	215,902	90	9,094	150,058	20,806	215,552	611,502
JHS-Int.	79,790	41	3,187	51,054	6,389	88,450	228,911
Academic High	64,798	133	3,331	33,673	5,616	128,536	236,087
Vocational High	12,938	25	463	12,122	667	12,722	38,937
Special Schools	3,520	--	19	2,148	96	1,945	7,728
TOTAL	376,948	289	16,094	249,055	33,574	447,205	1,123,165
Percent of Total	33.6	0.0[10]	1.4	22.2	3.0	39.8	100.0

[10]Less than 1/10th of 1 per cent.

Source: New York City Public Schools, Facts and Figures 1969-1970. New York: NYC Public Schools, 1970. Page 59.

TABLE 2.3

ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF DISTRICT PUPIL POPULATIONS,

NEW YORK CITY, 1970

	Ethnic Composition of Pupils (%)			
	Puerto Rican	Black	White	Other
Manhattan				
1	71	15	9	5
2	31	13	37	19
3	31	50	18	1
4	65	33	2	
5	16	82	1	1
6	38	36	25	
Bronx				
7	66	32	2	
8	42	30	28	
9	40	45	15	
10	22	21	57	
11	12	33	55	
12	57	38	5	
Brooklyn				
13	22	73	5	
14	63	27	10	
15	49	17	34	
16	31	60	9	
17	19	69	12	
18	7	31	62	
19	33	50	17	
20	10	11	79	
21	8	11	81	
22	2	9	89	
23	28	71	1	
Queens				
24	16	13	71	
25	4	9	87	
26	2	13	85	
27	4	28	67	
28	6	41	53	
29	4	57	39	
30	14	20	66	
Richmond				
31	3	8	87	

Source: United Parents Association, 1970. Cited in New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education, Report. Albany, N.Y., 1972. Vol. 3, P. 12.23.

and pension benefits, and a considerable strengthening in the morale and sense of unity of the teaching cadre (represented by the growth and success of the United Federation of Teachers). However, teachers are quite young and mobility is high. And, though the number of teaching posts the City provides may be filled, there is still a shortage of teachers if one uses average class size as an indicator (New York City--27, New York State--20.4, United States--22.7).

The quality of teachers is, of course, less easy to identify. Formal qualifications are slightly higher than in the rest of the nation, and comparable with, if not better than, other large cities. However, public judgments of the quality of teachers are increasingly based on pupil performance rather than on teacher credentials (or even teacher performance). The call for "teacher accountability" is a direct result of the knowledge that pupil achievement in standardized tests of reading, comprehension, and mathematics is (on the average for the City school system) below the national norms. High achievers are no doubt as numerous and as successful in New York as in other parts of the country. But it is the failures which test the energies of teachers and the efforts of the school system and excite public criticism and pressure.

Conclusion

Size, social and ethnic composition, and economy, as well as unique national settings and history, distinguish each of these world cities. Yet they have in common the strong links between their educational problems and the broader metropolitan processes--demographic, economic, social, and political--at work within them. At the center of one group of school problems lies the matter of mobility: teachers, pupils, even entire social groups are on the move into, around, and out of the metropolis. Closely associated with this is the development of great overall economic and social heterogeneity on the basis of increasingly homogeneous ethnic and social enclaves, another peculiarly metropolitan phenomenon creating serious difficulties for school systems. This is especially marked in those communities or areas inhabited by the poor and the migrant, where schools are expected to intervene in the cycle of deprivation.

The dimensions differ, of course, but whether in gigantic New York or in relatively small Amsterdam, the educational problems are fundamentally similar. First, there is the question of devising an organizational system which is economically sound, politically viable, and administratively efficient. It must be responsive to the special conditions or particular elements in the metropolis, but it must also be supported by the region or the nation and be capable of discharging the responsibilities for schooling entrusted to it. Second, there is the problem of staffing the schools, not only with adequate numbers of teachers, but with personnel who are competent to discharge more than the traditional, narrowly-defined instructional functions. And, third, there is the task of securing "quality schooling" for all, for maintaining satisfactory levels of pupil achievement throughout the system. Clearly, these objectives are not attainable by school-based efforts alone. They require planning and executive expertise from national to local levels, political collaboration, and the cooperation of an array of social agencies.

Efforts to maintain stability in metropolitan school systems and to improve them appear to be valiant and extensive in many places but still seem ineffectual before the tide of demographic and social change. The quantitative and qualitative dimensions of population migration and intra-metropolitan mobility are also undoubtedly an important factor. New York, for example, stands out as the city with the largest school population of the minority national culture, Blacks and Puerto Ricans, who are poor, and have traditionally been excluded from the educational, social, and economic opportunities for integration into the mainstream of American life. London's school system is suffering under the weight of a relatively recent increase in the rate of immigration from the West Indies, and the pattern of social and political tensions, economic and educational difficulties, is depressingly similar. However, the scale is small compared with New York, and though London, too, has districts where immigrants tend to be heavily concentrated, there are, as yet, no communities or schools which are almost totally non-white, as there are in New York. Whether it is because the scale is that much smaller, or the national and local governmental authorities have been better able to control conditions, Paris and Amsterdam do not seem to be overwhelmed by this specific issue, though they each have to contend with pockets of the poor and migrant among their metropolitan populations.

In London and Paris, the movement toward metropolitan regional government appears to be facilitating reorganization and planning, in general. Consistent with the traditional French administrative view of metropolitan France, educational efforts in Paris form merely part of the national reform movement and owe nothing (or very little) to the specific socio-educational problems of metropolitan Paris. In London, on the other hand, regionalization, while being the first step in Britain toward a thoroughgoing review of local government, has been undertaken with an eye to specifically local issues. In London, this is particularly true for the organization of schooling. Amsterdam has discussed regionalization but has not followed the path set by Rotterdam. New York City, unable to enlarge its political boundaries, has concentrated its efforts in another direction, decentralization of elements of school administration within the inflexible city boundaries. Necessary though this has been, it leaves unsolved the problem of finding an adequate fiscal base for supporting the complex and expensive solutions to the City's school problems. These problems happen to be concentrated in New York City, but are, in fact, regional if not national in their origins and effects. How far administrative boundaries approximate to the

functional realities of metropolitan life is certainly an important factor conditioning success of city services. In New York, the disjunction is painfully apparent.

A second element in the capacity of a metropolitan school system to cope with its problems is the extent to which it is politically progressive, relative to other governmental levels. Large cities tend to represent the more liberal, progressive elements within their own nations, politically speaking, and each of the four examples studied exemplify this generalization, though to varying degrees: London and New York most markedly, Paris and Amsterdam to a lesser extent.

Finally, the capacity of a particular school system to deal with its problems may depend on the extent to which it is open to local initiatives, from within or from outside the system. Teachers are involved in public decision making bodies in London, while parents and interested community leaders play a part (true, sometimes nominal) in determining the policies of individual schools as members of governing boards. In New York, the establishment of elected school boards at a community level is an attempt to open up the whole system so that it may become more diversified structurally, less centralized administratively, and more responsive to local needs expressed politically. In Amsterdam and Paris, both operating under more directive national administrative structures, public voices are incorporated much less overtly into policy making and implementation of school affairs, though in both cities the elected municipal governments do have roles to play, and in Amsterdam, in addition, the religious communities have a crucial voice in education.

P A R T II

CHAPTER 3

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS

Variables and Hypotheses

As we saw in Chapter 2, metropolitan school systems exhibit characteristics peculiar to their particular national traditions, even while they have many features and functions in common. Because of the differences among nations in the way education is organized and implemented, direct comparison of the characteristics of teachers working in cities in different countries is not possible. A teacher cadre may possess a particular status, set of qualifications, or role, for example, because of general national factors rather than specific metropolitan setting. Consequently if it is to be done at all, international comparison must proceed indirectly, via intra-national analysis first. In intra-national comparison we consider differences between, say, London and England; proceeding then to international comparison, we compare these differences with the differences between other metropolises and their respective national settings. In this way, we can control for general differences in the way educational systems of different nations are organized.

One of the basic propositions which this study intends to test is that there is a metropolitan type transcending the particular nation in which large cities develop. With respect to teachers, this translates into the generalization that teachers in a large city in a given country resemble teachers in large cities in other countries more than they resemble non-metropolitan teachers in their own land. Specifically, we hypothesize that teachers in large cities are very much alike and that they differ from their respective national norms in similar ways.

The teacher variables considered here fall into three groups: basic vital characteristics (such as age and sex); educational characteristics (such as levels of formal education, professional training); and professional characteristics (such a job mobility and membership in professional organizations).[1]

We would expect that, compared to their national counterparts outside the big city, metropolitan teachers are younger, more mobile, and more likely to be male. Furthermore, it is believed that they will be found to be better educated, though not necessarily in the formal/professional sense, and more likely to move out of teaching into some other career after a period of time. In this sense, therefore, they might be described as less professionally committed. However, being younger, more mobile, probably having a higher proportion of males than the national teacher cadre, they might well be more open to change not only in their personal careers but also in their teaching lives (with respect to changing posts and to being involved in educational innovations).

The rationale for this expected profile of the large-city teacher is fairly clear. It is drawn from the larger picture of life in the metropolis, one of relatively high rates of geographical and economic mobility, especially among those beginning their professional careers, and of higher pay levels and more opportunities for advancement than in the nation at large.

Profiles of the Teacher Cadres

Before comparing the data, a brief profile of the teaching cadre in each city will serve to set the comparisons in their respective contexts.

Amsterdam

In recent years, Amsterdam has suffered from a shortage of teachers, but a large recruiting effort has eased this problem. As a result, the teacher cadre is very young (the proportion of teachers under 29 years of age has risen to nearly half), and due to mobility patterns seems likely to remain so for some time. Owing to the severe shortage of reasonably priced housing, beginning teachers typically move out of Amsterdam once they have married and begin to raise a family. However, there appears to be some movement back toward teaching in the city on the part of older teachers (over 50 years). Their children will now be grownup, living away from home, very possibly at a university (and, thus, likely to be at the University of Amsterdam), and the

---

[1] The complete list of variables on which data were sought may be found in Appendix 2.

parents are now willing and able to move to the city (or back to the city) to enjoy its superior cultural and educational attractions. The relatively high proportion of female teachers (compared to the national norm) is no doubt another factor contributing to mobility. Thus, the turnover rate among teachers is considerable, reaching as high as 25 per cent in recent years.

Reference has already been made to the nationwide efforts to reform the structure and the operating methods of the Netherlands school system. Particularly in Amsterdam the efforts to involve teachers in in-service training of various kinds are noteworthy. Reform of teaching methods, curriculum innovation, and a redefined role for the teacher are very much in evidence. However, one factor in particular inhibits any comprehensive effort to influence the teaching cadre in this direction, the traditional separation between primary teachers, prepared in teacher training institutions, and secondary academic teachers, who are university graduates with some professional training for teaching. The gulf between the two has been marked by the very different statuses of the preparatory institutions (for the first, the secondary school level; for the second, the tertiary level), and different social and educational backgrounds of students of each type of institution. The training schools are in the process of being "upgraded," but the progress is slow.

London

London's shortage of qualified teachers of some years ago has abated, so that the former quota system for London school districts (which set an upper limit to the proportion of the total teaching staff that could be fully qualified) now serves to set minimum standards. As a result of a sustained recruitment drive, a high proportion of London teachers is young (42 per cent are under 29 years of age). However, a similar career pattern to that of other metropolitan areas appears in London: well-qualified, young, unmarried teachers join the system; after a few years, those who marry and have children move out to the suburban areas in search of housing that is cheaper and more suited to their needs. Being well-qualified and experienced, they have little difficulty in obtaining desirable posts in schools either in the more acceptable parts of London or the areas around it. Thus, turnover rates are considerable (about 18 per cent per annum in recent years). The fact that London's teaching staff is about 70 per cent female contributes to the high level of mobility.

Teacher mobility in London, as in other parts of the country, is in part a consequence of the structure of the reward system within the profession, the national (Burnham Committee) salary scales. So-called "posts of special responsibility" are established for subject area coordinators, department heads, and so forth. Extra monetary rewards (special responsibility allowances) are attached to these positions and young teachers with about five to ten years of experience, in particular, move about from school to school and from one local authority to another in search of promotions and the SRA's that go with them. Large schools have a higher proportion of positions carrying SRA's and London is particularly well-endowed with large schools. Hence, the high rates of teacher mobility in London are in part an outcome of the structure of the career ladder adopted for teachers in England.

The great attractiveness of London for people from all over the country clearly is important in the educational job market as in other areas of employment. As a survey of science and mathematics teachers in the ILEA states, "London attracts young, well qualified people who after a few years prefer or are forced to settle outside the London area . . . "[2]

The presence in London of a relatively young, inexperienced but well credentialed teacher cadre points to the need for in-service professional opportunities. Mention has already been made of the multi-purpose Teachers Centres, one for each of the ten divisions within the ILEA. The intention is to develop also specialized centers devoted to particular subjects or areas of the curriculum. The ILEA reports a total enrollment of nearly 11,500 teachers in the full- and part-time courses held at local teachers' centers during 1969-70.

A serious obstacle to London's attempts to modernize the curriculum and to find new ways of dealing with the school problems of the poor and the immigrants, is the traditional dualism in teacher preparation which has produced a divided profession, even though recent events have done much to close the gap. Primary school teachers as well as teachers for non-academic secondary schools were typically prepared in training colleges, where they received a professional credential, but not a degree, on completion of their courses of training. Grammar school (academic secondary school) teachers usually earned a bachelor's degree and frequently, though not always, entered the teaching profession after a further year of graduate professional training. Two recent developments have served to close the gap between these two parts of the teaching profession: the lengthening of training college courses to three years (comparable with the period normally required to earn a first college degree) combined with the creation of the new B.Ed. degree, and the trend toward non-selective secondary schooling in comprehensive secondary schools. The ILEA has been in the forefront of the latter movement, and it is to be expected that the traditional two-class system among teachers will be rapidly eroded.

---

[2]ILEA, Science and Mathematics Teachers Survey, 1969. P. 33.

Paris

In the French centralized school system, a permanent appointment to a Paris school represents a professional promotion, especially at the secondary level, for Paris is particularly endowed with well-regarded lycées. Thus, teachers, once receiving such an appointment, tend to remain in their posts. For these reasons, the teacher cadre of Paris is somewhat older, more experienced, and better qualified than is the norm for the nation. It should be noted that while the reward system of French schooling tends to create a teaching cadre in Paris possessing superior professional characteristics, several other factors tend to work in the opposite direction.

First, expansion and variegation of secondary schooling has brought into the system a number of new and young teachers. Paris has probably been affected to a lesser degree than other parts of France by this development, nevertheless expansion of the cadre does in fact change the age structure of the teaching profession. Second, since Paris is an especially attractive center for university students, there is a rich source of potential teachers with good educational qualifications, though without a full professional training. These have in recent years swelled the Parisian teaching cadre. Many of them are quite likely to be using teaching as a temporary career while they study or complete their examinations for other activities. Furthermore, over 70 per cent of Paris primary school teachers are female (higher than all but three other departments in France). Thus, while one set of factors contributes to the stability and seniority of Paris teachers, expansion and feminization both tend to produce mobility and youthfulness. The growing militancy of young teachers marks their sense of being excluded from the profession proper.

As in England and the Netherlands, an important feature of the French teaching profession is the traditional dualism between the university trained professeurs who teach in the academic secondary schools, and the instituteurs, trained in normal schools, who teach in the primary schools. The attempts to reform, modernize, and integrate the various parts of the French educational system and to increase opportunities for popular advancement have been obstructed by this differentiation of teaching cadres, as well as by other traditional features of school structure and educational practice. A further obstacle to achieving a more unified teaching profession is the sharp difference in the social origins of the two groups. The majority of instituteurs are of working-class or lower middle-class origin; the majority of professeurs come from middle-class or professional backgrounds. There are indications, however, that these differences are being gradually blunted and that, in particular, this social-class distinction has been less sharply marked in the Paris region in recent decades.[3]

New York

In recent years, two features have distinguished the teachers of New York City: they have become more militant, as demonstrated by the rise of an activist teachers' union and unprecedentedly successful strike actions; and they have become targets of a powerful and sustained wave of public criticism. Because of the intense concern about poor conditions in the schools, and the highly political nature of school policy, teachers are a very visible and natural target for those who attempt to apportion blame and for those attempting changes of one kind or another. As the other cities discussed, the job security of teachers is protected by contractual provisions (tenure laws). After some years of teacher shortage, most posts are now filled; after the attainment of an improved contract and pension provisions, the holding power of the system is stronger. Mean salaries, starting salaries, and pensions are high by national standards, though whether they fully compensate for the City's high cost of living is debatable. According to official figures, teacher turnover is remarkably low considering recent adverse developments in teachers' conditions of work: the growth of violence in schools; the negative attitudes of pupils and the public toward schooling; and the politicization of educational decisions. However, the employment of a substantial number of teachers on a short-term or day-to-day basis (who are then excluded from turnover rates) no doubt explains the relatively low figure of about 15 per cent turnover. On the other hand, in the last year or so, fears have been expressed that a surplus of teachers is developing, as growth in the output of the training establishments continues, enrollments decline, and budgets for the school system decrease (or cease to grow).

Teachers in New York are fairly young (about 52 per cent are under 33) and, consequently, include a large proportion of relatively inexperienced teachers. They are well-qualified as far as credentials are concerned.

The proportion of teachers who are men has been rising, nationally and locally, though women remain a majority in the teaching profession, especially at the primary level. Women, though a majority of the teacher cadre in New York are proportionately fewer than in other parts of the country, unlike the other three cities where the percentage of males tends to be higher than is the national norm.

---

[3] See, for example, "La representation de la condition du maître dans la société" and "L'image du maître" in Enfance, 2-3, 1966, and, Ida Berger and Roger Benjamin, L'Univers des Instituteurs. Paris, Les Editions de Minuit, 1964.

Comparison of Data

There are at least three possible definitions of the metropolitan teacher: one who teaches in the city but who may live elsewhere; one who lives in the city but who may teach elsewhere; and one who both lives and teaches in the city. The definition used here is the first, since available data were related to teaching positions in the city and data relating to the other two categories were not generally available.

Table 3.1 presents data on the characteristics of teachers for the four cities and the four nations on a series of selected indicators. Table 3.2 presents a series of indexes, based on these data, which permit comparison among cities. Indexes were obtained in the following manner. For each indicator, the national figure was equated with 100. The corresponding figure for the metropolis was then expressed as an index with the national average used as the base, i.e., metropolitan values were expressed as percentages of national values on each indicator. Inspection of the metropolitan indexes then makes possible some statements about the direction and extent of deviations by metropolitan teachers from their respective national norms and comparison of the indexes across nations.

The results of the analyses in Table 3.2 make possible the following generalizations. Teacher cadres of metropolises differ from their respective national norms in the following ways:

they include a larger proportion of younger teachers and a smaller proportion of older teachers;

they contain a higher percentage of women;

they tend to be better qualified academically and, while containing a larger proportion of teachers with superior credentials, have a smaller proportion without full qualifications;

they contain a larger proportion of teachers with limited experience, this being consistent with the data on age;

they are less prone to belong to professional organizations, likely to devote less time to preparing for classes (though this is not true of time spent marking classwork), less likely to read professional journals regularly (though more likely to have attended a professional conference during the past year), and they include a larger proportion of part-time teachers.

We have not been able to assemble evidence that would enable us to test the propositions that, compared with their colleagues elsewhere, teachers in the metropolises exhibit a higher rate of mobility out of teaching to other occupations; that they are more innovative in their teaching; or, that they are more varied in their social origins.

The generalizations that we can make do not, of course, apply in every single case, nor, where the data tend to point in the same direction, are the differences always of the same extent. On age, Paris is an exception to the generalization made above, with a lower proportion of young teachers than the national norm (but still with a slightly lower proportion of older teachers, too). This fact is easily explained by reference to the professional reward and promotion system in France and by the general preeminence of Paris secondary schools in the French educational system. The teacher cadres of Amsterdam and New York stand out as especially youthful. The data on teaching experience are, as might be expected, consistent with those on age.

We had hypothesized that the metropolitan teacher cadres are more male than the national norms. We find, on the contrary, that with the exception of New York, they are not. Instead they are more feminized, with the extent differing very markedly from country to country.

One explanation for the fact that females form a smaller proportion of teachers in New York City than in the United States as a whole might be that women have more employment opportunities other than in teaching in New York than elsewhere. However, since this is probably true for the other major cities in this study, that explanation is not sufficient. A more sturdy explanation might refer to the relatively high salaries, the high proportion of administrative positions (relative to classroom positions), and the extensive opportunities for additional part-time employment, that might make a career in teaching in New York more attractive for males than is usual in the United States. In any event, it should be noted that the United States has the most feminized teacher corps of the four nations and that the present trend is toward an increase in the proportion of male teachers.

In general, the data on teacher experience and qualifications do exemplify the broad hypothesis that metropolitan teachers are a somewhat more variegated group than their national counterparts. Amsterdam stands out as having the greatest contrast between metropolitan and national standards and Paris stands out with the least. While the latter is clearly explicable by the nationwide standardization and direction of education, the reason for Amsterdam's striking departure from national norms is not so apparent. The answer may well lie in the greater opportunities for secondary and higher education offered by Amsterdam compared with the rest of the country.

TABLE 3.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS: INTRA- AND INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS

	AMST.	NETH.	LONDON	E.&W.	PARIS	FRANCE	N.Y.	U.S.A.
Age								
% under 30 yrs.*	45.0		42.0	32.4		36.8	43.1	33.9
% under 27 yrs.*	33.0	18.8	42.0	32.7	14.0	18.8	65.0	34.4
% over 48 yrs.	11.0	26.2	12.0	18.5	22.0	24.5	12.0	17.5
Sex								
% females	60.8	38.8	63.0	57.0	54.8	50.3	59.2	67.3
Qualifications								
% lacking full qualifications for post	11.0		18.3	12.3	22.3	26.0	4.7	4.9
% possessing high academic qualifications for post	57.6		28.6	22.2	77.7	74.0	34.7	30.3
% specialists with no univ. degree	22.0	36.5	25.0	51.2	14.0	7.3	0.0	0.0
% w. over 4 yrs. post-sec. full-time ed.	89.0	35.7	13.0	9.0	56.0	54.5	94.0	83.5
Experience								
% with 3 yrs. or less						24.25	39.0	21.0
% with 5 yrs. or less	56.0	21.7	42.0	36.3	29.0	32.3	59.0	38.0
Turnover								
% of teaching force leaving p.a.	25.0		13.3	10.6			14.3	19.5
% w. less than 5 yrs. in current school	22.0	54.3	72.0	64.5	41.0	54.1	76.0	59.9
Professionalism								
% working for supplementary income	25.0		29.0	23.0				20.0
% who are members of largest union			97.0	80.0			25.0	59.9
% who are members of general teaching assoc.	56.0	74.6	73.0	81.6	67.0	74.6	76.0	77.3
% who are members of subject matter teaching assoc.	56.0	27.5	12.0	28.6	43.0	54.5	56.0	48.1
% spending < 3 hrs.--preparing lessons	22.0	27.1	33.0	24.9	4.0	1.9	26.0	7.0
--marking	0.0	13.6	30.0	21.3	4.0	3.8	15.0	14.0
% who regularly read journals --about teaching	33.0	49.3	28.0	44.6	29.0	27.8	35.0	50.7
--about subject	78.0	57.5	48.0	49.4	61.0	63.7	56.0	58.4
% attendance at ed. conference in past yr.	56.0	53.6	56.0	50.5	70.0	42.5	44.0	61.4
% of teachers teaching full-time	44.0	83.5	67.0	92.3	81.0	89.3	93.0	91.7
% of teachers not teaching full-time			14.6	5.5				

*Data for these two indicators are usually derived from different sources.

This explains the apparent contradiction in, for example, the N.Y./U.S.A. data (where there appear to be more teachers under 27 years than under 30 years).

Sources:
Amsterdam and the Netherlands
Bureau van Statistiek der Gemeente Amsterdam, Statistiek van het Onderwijs te Amsterdam (1968/'69, Deel I). Amsterdam 1970.

Jahrboek 1970. Amsterdam: Bureau van Statistiek, 1970.

Sources: (Cont'd.)
Planning and Development in the Netherlands, Vol. III, No. 1/2. 1969.

Council of Europe, School Systems: a Guide. Strasbourg, 1965.

Central Bureau voor de Statistiek, Statistiek van het VWO, HAVO en MAVO 1968/'69. 's-Gravenhage, 1970.

Materials supplied by personnel of City School System, Amsterdam.

London and England/Wales
Greater London Council, 1968: Annual Abstract of Greater London Statistics. London, 1969.

Department of Education and Science, Statistics of Education. Vol. 1: Schools (1968); Vol. 4: Teachers (1968); Vol. 1: Schools (1969). London, 1969, 1970.

Materials provided by Dr. A. Little, Director, Research and Statistics Group and additional personnel of I.L.E.A.

Paris and France
Ministère de l'Education Nationale, Statistiques des Enseignements (1968-69). Nos. 3.1; 3.2; 3.3. Paris, 1969.

Ministère de l'Education Nationale, Tableaux Statistiques 1969-70. Paris, 1970. (mimeo. doc. no. 3870)

Ministère de l'Education Nationale, Etudes et Documents No. 19. Paris, 1971.

New York and the United States
National Education Association, Research Division, The American Public-School Teacher, 1965-66. Washington, D.C., 1967.

New York State Division of the Budget, Statistical Yearbook 1970. Albany, 1970.

University of the State of New York, State Education Department, Annual Educational Summary 1968-69. Albany, 1969.

New York City Public Schools, Facts and Figures 1969-1970. New York, 1970.

Materials supplied by Division of Teacher Education, City University of New York and Central Board of Education, New York City.

TABLE 3.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS: COMPARATIVE INDEXES

INDEXES (rate for nation is always 100)	AMST.	LONDON	PARIS	N.Y.
Age				
under 30	--	130	--	127
under 27	176	128	74	189
over 48	42	65	90	69
Sex				
female	157	111	109	88
Qualifications				
lacking full qualifications	--	149	86	96
possessing high qualifications	--	129	105	115
with no univ. degree	25	49	192	--
with over 4 yrs. f.t. post-sec. ed.	249	144	103	113
Experience				
with 3 yrs. or less	--	--	--	186
with 5 yrs. or less	258	116	90	155
Turnover				
leaving teaching p.a.	--	125	--	73
with 5 yrs. or less in current school	41	112	76	127
Professionalism				
working for supplementary income	--	126	--	--
membership of largest union	--	121	--	42
membership of general teaching assoc.	75	89	90	98
membership of subject matter assoc.	204	42	79	116
less than 3 hrs. per week for prep.	81	133	211	371
" " " " " " grading	--	141	105	107
regular reading of journals about teaching	67	63	104	69
" " " " " subject	136	97	96	96
attendance at ed. conf. in past year	104	111	165	72
teachers teaching full-time	53	73	91	101
teachers not teaching full-time	--	265	--	--

The data on teacher mobility show mixed results, with London and New York having a slightly larger proportion of teachers with relatively less staying power than the national averages, and Paris and Amsterdam both having a smaller group of teachers with five years or less experience in their current schools than is average for the nation. If it can be assumed that younger teachers tend to be more mobile, these data on turnover are consistent with the data on age and experience for London, Paris, and New York.

On the variable "professionalism," metropolitan teachers tend to be below national norms according to the indicators used here. While these data are not cross-nationally complete or reliable, there is a widespread impression that metropolitan teachers are more likely to hold additional part-time employment, though whether this is moonlighting in teaching or in other occupations is not established.

Does the lower level of professionalism of metropolitan teachers occur in spite of, or because of, their relatively higher levels of qualifications? Is it that metropolitan teachers simply do not need to read as many professional journals, belong to professional organizations, and devote as much time to preparation as their less qualified colleagues do in the provinces? Or, is it that their environment places more pressure on their time and provides greater opportunities for other activities, including extra employment or preparation for different careers? These questions, unanswerable without further data and analyses, relate to the interplay between metropolitan environmental conditions and the particular characteristics of its teacher cadres. However, another set of questions points to the possible relationship between these characteristics of teachers and the extent to which metropolitan school systems are successful according to the several criteria conventionally used. It is to that dimension that we now turn.

CHAPTER 4

THE PERCEIVED SUCCESS OF METROPOLITAN SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Variables and Hypotheses

Success is a much debated term in education. And argument about school issues often derives from differences in unexpressed definitions of the word, success, which may very well conceal fundamental differences of values. In this study, we attempt no refinements at the philosophical level and no more justification at the operational level than to say that the indicators of success used have been chosen to cover several dimensions of the term, and are conventionally put forward by school systems and discussed by teachers and parents as important and relevant criteria. It is for these reasons that we use the qualification "perceived," to emphasize the relative nature of the word "success" and to avoid any hint of absoluteness in the operational definitions referred to in this study.

All school systems are concerned with the achievements of their pupils and measure these from time to time by means of examinations or tests in particular subjects of the curriculum at various levels. In addition to the regional and national assessments within countries, we have been able also to obtain achievement scores in science and native language from the I.E.A. Project.[1]

While the achievement of pupils is one important measure, a series of additional indicators is conventionally used as a criterion of institutional or system success. This includes such items as average class size (or teacher/pupil ratio); the system's ability to retain pupils beyond the age of compulsory schooling and to usher them on to more than minimal qualifications (retentivity); and the degree to which the system has developed special facilities for those pupils who are not within the normal range of competences (facilities for special education).

These by no means exhaust the possibilities for data collection on measures of success. In particular, we would have liked to assemble evidence of the extent of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the school system expressed by teachers, pupils, parents, and other public voices. The kind and extent of criticism leveled at school operations, attempts to disrupt schooling by strikes and demonstrations, and even the amount of vandalism against school property are all likely to be indicative of how successfully a school system is satisfying its clients. But difficulties of obtaining documented evidence of a comparable nature for both metropolis and nation are especially acute here. Impressions, of course, abound, and are cited here and there in this study. But in the absence of adequate data, we have been forced to limit severely the indicators of perceived success used in the analysis.[2]

We would expect that the achievement of metropolitan pupils differs from national norms by being on the average higher, more diversified (having a larger spread) and, in particular, by having a larger proportion of high achievers; that metropolitan school systems show more pupils per teacher, more facilities for special groups, and greater retentivity. Finally, we can consider as a mark of dissatisfaction with the public schools the extent to which parents seek alternative arrangements for their children in private and parochial schools, and predict that in the metropolis parents will be more likely to choose non-public school alternatives.

The rationale for these expectations is drawn from our general profile of big-city populations and structures. Metropolitan pupils, we assume, are more heterogeneous than those in the rest of the nation, as are the teachers, whether by socio-economic origin, ethnic, or religious affiliation, or other dimensions of life style. They will represent a more diversified set of behaviors, attitudes, and aspirations which might be expected to reveal themselves in more diversified levels of achievement in school. But, because of the concentration of wealth and high-level schools, we would also expect to find in the metropolises a relatively larger concentration

---

[1]The International Association for the Assessment of Educational Achievement has recently completed a comparative study of student performance in science and native language (known as the IEA Project). Samples of students at several age/grade levels were tested in twenty-one countries (though all of the countries did not participate in all the testing). In addition to performance data, the study gathered information on student background and on teacher and school characteristics.

[2]The complete list of variables on which data were sought may be found in Appendix 2.

of high achievers. Not only will pupils and teachers represent a more diversified group, but so also will parents, whose educational aspirations for their children will be more varied than those of the nation as a whole.

Population size and higher density are expected to yield two results: more pupils per teacher (or more overcrowded classrooms) and more developed facilities for special educational provisions. Finally, school systems in large cities might be expected to have greater powers of retaining students beyond compulsory school for several reasons. The array of opportunities **is larger; horizons and aspirations of students are broader and higher; occupational vistas are more numerous and are more likely to require higher educational qualifications than in locations outside the metropolis.**

Profiles of Metropolitan School Success

Amsterdam

In a country noted for its extremely high population density, Amsterdam has a particular concentration of specialized and advanced educational institutions. With only about 7½ per cent of the total population of the Netherlands, Amsterdam provided about 27 per cent of the first-year students at the University of Amsterdam in 1967-8. In other respects, too, the city's school system serves the nation, as well as the metropolis. Some 12 per cent of the children in its special education facilities and 18 per cent of those in technical and vocational schools of various types come from outside the city, not merely from adjacent communities but also from more distant parts of the country. The city shows high rates of pre-schooling.

It is hardly surprising that in recent years, shortage of basic educational resources has been a particular concern in Amsterdam. Due to changes in the birth rate and increased demand and opportunity for education, the secondary school pupil population almost doubled in the period 1950-1962. Though it has since declined, it remained 66 per cent higher in 1968 than in 1950. As the teacher shortage eased, class size, a leading issue, has been reduced in the last seven years from 33.4 to 30.4 pupils on average. In deprived areas of the city, special allocations of resources have lowered average class size still further, to 20.3 pupils. But 20 per cent of primary schools contain over 36 pupils, and overcrowding remains a problem.

London

London's school population has grown in recent decades not merely as a result of increase in the school age cohorts, but also because of successful attempts to encourage pupils to stay at school beyond the end of compulsory schooling. Retentivity rates for London are generally higher than for other parts of the country. This may be due, among other reasons, to the fact that London has a larger proportion of its secondary students in comprehensive schools than is usual for the nation at large. Associated with this is the finding that proportions of students attempting public examinations at the upper secondary level are a little higher than elsewhere. However, though the success rates for Greater London are higher, they are marginally lower for the Inner London area. It should be noted, nevertheless, that a recent study of student chances of continuing on to higher education by region and district, found that the highest proportions of students moving on to the universities are located in particular communities in London.[3] This suggests the likelihood that comparison of <u>average</u> success rates between London and the nation hides the bi-modal distribution of success <u>in London</u> (compared with a more normal curve of distribution in England), with disproportionate numbers doing well and doing poorly.

In other categories of achievement, specifically reading skill, a study for 1968 showed a considerable decline with norms well below national standards, tending to confirm the supposition that in London, the distribution of success is not a normal curve.[4] Attendance rates are quite good (89 per cent on average) but vary considerably depending on the area. Class size is on average 26.2 (primary level), though classes with over 40 pupils may be found. In comparison with the rest of the country, London reveals high rates of provision for both pre-schooling and special education.

Several important recent developments should be noted as relevant to the discussion of success in the London school system. Notwithstanding the traditional forward-mindedness of the administration, the high caliber of staff, and the redesigning of many aspects of schooling, dissatisfaction with the schools has been growing at a rapid rate. Evidence can be seen in the

---

[3] See <u>Where</u>, 66, February 1972. Pp. 52-53. Of the fifteen boroughs in England listed as highest in <u>this</u> respect, thirteen are in the GLC area; of the eight with lowest rates of retention and transfer to higher education, two are ILEA boroughs.

[4] ILEA, "Literacy Survey: Summary of Interim Results of the Study of Pupils' Reading Standards." London (n.d., mimeo).

press of the rise of student vandalism and the development of an embryonic student-power movement. These are marked in London but not evident as part of the school scene in other locations.

Paris

The student strikes, disturbances, and other demonstrations which reached a peak in Paris about four years ago were for the most part carried on by university students. However, normaliens (that is, students at teacher training colleges and lycéens (pre-university students) were also active in the schools and in the streets during that period. Normal activities at several nationally renowned Paris lycées were interrupted on a number of occasions. While the targets of student dissatisfaction were numerous and varied, they included many features of the educational system: overcrowding, excessive work, emphasis on examinations, traditional and formal instructional methods, and an outmoded curriculum. Irrespective of the merits or otherwise of the students' case, a school system opposed so vigorously that it has at times been unable to operate normally can hardly be considered as completely successful. Thus, though the parental or public criticisms of such aspects of schooling as standards of achievement or overcrowding do not appear to be as strident as in, say, London and New York, nevertheless, conditions in the Parisian school system can hardly be considered satisfactory.

Especially in France, it is difficult to separate the metropolitan from the national considerations. For the past two decades, at least, serious deficiencies of the educational system have been recognized and nationwide reforms at all levels have been introduced. As in other European countries, these have been concerned, first, with easing the strangle-hold of the university entrance examinations on the highly selective, competitive, and socially restrictive secondary level of education, and, second, with modernizing curriculum and instructional methods and the various paths toward employment in adult life. In general, the structural and internal changes which have been taking place are common to the nation, not specific to Paris.

Paris, in particular, and other large cities have traditionally provided far more chances for schooling than other parts of the country. Hence, one of the major concerns in reform has been to equalize opportunity among the various regions of France. A comparison of the provision of secondary education in the twenty-three academies (1968-9), however, reveals that Paris rates roughly in the middle of the national range on the seventeen indicators used.[5] These measure levels of scolarisation, (the extent to which youngsters of a given age do in fact make use of the opportunities for schooling), elements in the school structure, and also such qualitative dimensions as teacher and pupil qualifications. Other data confirm the impression that by such measures as success rates on public examinations and average class size, Paris does not differ appreciably from national norms. On the other hand, provisions for pre-school education and, especially, for special education are greater in Paris than in the nation at large. In the period 1962-69, the number of primary classes in Paris increased by 45 per cent, the public secondary school population grew by 36 per cent (and the size of the student body at the tertiary level doubled). It appears, too, that the proportion of youngsters staying on at school after the end of compulsory schooling was, and continues to remain, high in Paris (though it is rising in other parts of the country far faster than in Paris).

New York

From the undiminished spate of public criticism in the press and other publications, the public schools of New York City are clearly failing to achieve whatever it is that is expected of them. Violence, vandalism, extortion rackets, and drug traffic are widespread; achievement levels in such basic skills as reading and arithmetic are low, notwithstanding great efforts to attend to them by special programs. Teachers are demanding more police protection, and pupils and various public groups are demanding changes which, they believe, would increase the relevance of curriculum and teaching methods to their particular needs and vested interests. There appears to be no aspect of the public system which can escape criticism from one direction or another, whether it is licensing requirements and procedures for teachers, the handling of children with special physical or emotional problems, organization and financing, or building maintenance. From these indications, it appears that public confidence in the schools services continues to decline, as it does in other public services such as police, sanitation, the legal system, and transportation.

The burden of numbers and of costs on New York's schools is exceptionally onerous. New York City maintains extensive pre-school and special education facilities, that far exceed the national norm. Moreover, in the decade since 1959, pupil numbers have grown by about 18 per cent

---

[5]Ministère de l'Education Nationale, Service Central des Statistiques et Sondages, Indicateurs Relatifs aux Disparités Regionales 1968/9 en Matière d'Enseignement du Second Degré. Paris, 1971.

at the same time the social and ethnic distribution of public school enrollment has become lopsided.[6] Census data since 1950 show that, typically, middle-class whites are moving out of the city, so that the absolute increase in pupil numbers represents a growth of minority ethnic groups, often poor and from rural areas, of far more than 18 per cent. Classes are regarded as too large to permit the kind of individual attention necessary for the varied and deprived pupils.

Attendance rates in New York City schools are about 5 per cent below State levels. Approximately 30,000 pupils leave the school system without obtaining a diploma each year. Of the ninth grade population in 1965, 32 per cent had dropped out by 1968, 22 per cent received a general diploma, 11 per cent a vocational or commercial diploma, 24 per cent an academic diploma (and 11 per cent transferred to other systems).[7]

Comparison of Data

Table 4.1 presents the quantified data on selected indicators for each city and nation, while Table 4.2 presents indexes based on the data which permit comparison of the direction and extent of divergence of each city from its national norms.

The results of the analyses in Table 4.2 permit the following generalizations:

school achievement of students in the four metropolises tends to be higher than the national average on some measures and lower on others:

school retentivity is usually higher in the metropolis;

the big-city school system is more highly developed in the sense of providing more special facilities for special groups outside the normal range of primary/secondary schooling;

these school systems have more pupils per teacher and more overcrowded classrooms.

We hasten to add, however, that though these generalizations are permitted by the comparative analyses, the data are not always complete or consistent. The picture is mixed, with enough variability to require careful scrutiny of each indicator and each city.

For Paris and Amsterdam, all the indicators of achievement show means higher than the national, except for science in Paris. For London and New York, the achievement norms are mixed: the IEA results show that pupils in the metropolises do rather better than those in the nation at large, New York being marginally better and London markedly so; but in the basic skill areas, especially reading, both cities fall below the national norms. In achievement at the higher level leading to continued full-time education beyond the secondary level, Paris and Amsterdam are above the national norms, New York is below, and London the same or slightly below. As noted above (p.25), other evidence from England suggests that the comparison of metropolitan and national means probably obscures very different distributions of patterns of success in achievement, with a pattern approximating a normal distribution nationally and a tendency toward a bimodal distribution, with high proportions of both high and low levels of achievement in London. This phenomenon, we suspect, is not limited to London alone, it may well be a general metropolitan phenomenon and would explain some of the inconsistencies among indicators of success, especially for achievement and retentivity.

Rates of staying on at school beyond the end of compulsory schooling are on the whole consistent with rates of continuing on to higher education, except for the case of London. In Paris and Amsterdam, as in the case of achievement, retentivity is above the national norms, while in New York retentivity is below. However, in London, retentivity is higher while rates of continuing to university or other full-time education after schooling are lower.

In each country, the metropolis tends to have developed a more elaborate system to accommodate those pupils outside the normal range of the primary/secondary schools. The ratios of pre-school and special education pupils to primary pupils are higher in the metropolis than in the respective nations, sometimes extremely so, with one exception: pre-schooling in Amsterdam. Finally, the finding that classes in the city are larger should be considered more as a function of the factor of population density, than a matter of deliberate choice. Rural classes and the number of pupils per teacher, we assume, are smaller simply because pupils and schools are more dispersed.

---

[6] If public confidence is measured by the drift to private education, it should be noted that the increase in all kinds of private education during the same period was only 4 per cent. However, Jewish and non-sectarian school enrollments grew at greater rates (31 and 65 per cent respectively). Furthermore, private schooling appears to be more characteristic of large cities in the U.S. generally. New York Department of City Planning, Three Out of Ten: The Non-Public Schools of New York City. New York, March, 1972.

[7] These figures do not include diplomas received from night schools or "equivalency diplomas."

TABLE 4.1A

PATTERNS OF SCHOOL SUCCESS: INTRA-NATIONAL COMPARISONS

		Amst.	Neth.
Achievement			
% of elem. students who fail (1968)	Public	5.0	
	Denom.	4.9	
Science achievement means*		26.0	17.8
		34.3	25.2
Retentivity			
% of 15 yr. olds in school 1968/69		84.1	77)
% of 16 yr. olds in school 1968/69		64.1	58 (1969
% of 17 yr. olds in school 1968/69		45.5	39.4)
System Development			
Av. class size, elem.	Public	31.4	
	Denom.	29.3	
	Total	30.4	
Teacher/pupil ratio		1:23.8	1:29
Ratio of primary pupils (Index 100)			
to pre-school		28.9	34
to special ed.		6.3	4.9

Sources

*IEA data

Bureau van Statistiek der Gemeente Amsterdam, Jaarboek 1970. Amsterdam, 1970. Pp. 264-5, 272.

Bureau van Statistiek der Gemeente Amsterdam, Statistische Mededelingen No. 170: Statistiek van het Onderwijs te Amsterdam 1968/69. Amsterdam, 1970. Pp. 28,30.

Gemeente Amsterdam, Statistische Mededelingen van de Afdeling Onderwijs No. 74: Openbaar Onderwijs Staat der Schoolbevolking. Amsterdam, 1970.

Central Bureau of Statistics, Statistical Yearbook of the Netherlands 1971. The Hague, 1971. P. 82.

Council of Europe, School Systems: A Guide: The Netherlands. Strasbourg, 1965, 1965. Pp. 28-29.

TABLE 4.1B

PATTERNS OF SCHOOL SUCCESS: INTRA-NATIONAL COMPARISONS

		London	E. & W.
Achievement			
% of pupils who are good readers (1967)		10	16.7
% of pupils who are poor readers (1967)		17	8.6
% of school leavers bound for university	B	6	6
	G	2	3
for Coll. of Ed.	B	1	1
	G	4	5
for other full-time ed.	B	4	8
	G	5	11
Science achievement means*		26.8	21.3
Reading comprehension means*		32.4	25.3
Literature achievement means*		22.5	16.1
Retentivity			
% of leavers leaving at 15 yrs. (all maintained schools 1966/7)	B	33	46
	G	32	47
Pupils aged 16 as % of those aged 13, 3 yrs. previously		36.3	30.2
Pupils aged 17 as % of those aged 13, 4 yrs. previously		17.5	16.1
System Development			
% of all pupils in private schooling		6.4	4.7
Av. teacher/pupil ratio--primary		26.2	27.8
--sec.		15.9	15.9
Ratio of primary pupils (Index 100) to pre-school (2-4 yrs.)		7.4	5.0
to special ed.		4.4	1.5

Sources

*IEA data

Department of Education and Science, Statistics of Education 1969: Vol. 1, Schools. London, 1970. Pp. 2, 8, 23, 27, 100-101, 142.

Department of Education and Science, Statistics of Education 1968: Vol. 4, Teachers. London, 1970.

Central Statistical Office, Social Trends. No. 1, 1970. London, 1970. Pp. 126, 128-131.

Greater London Council, 1968: Annual Abstract of Greater London Statistics. Vol. 3. London, 1969. Pp. 132-133, 136, 139-143.

Data supplied by officials of I.L.E.A.

Inner London Education Authority Statistics Group, School Leavers. London (n.d., mimeo.). Pp. 3-6, 9-26.

Inner London Education Authority, Literacy Survey: Summary of Interim Results of the Study of Pupils' Reading Standards. London (n.d., mimeo.).

Department of Education and Science, Reports on Education. Dec. 1970, No. 67.

TABLE 4.1C

PATTERNS OF SCHOOL SUCCESS: INTRA-NATIONAL COMPARISONS

		Paris	France
Achievement			
% receiving graduating diplomas at end of 2nd cycle long (1969)	Académie	20.7	17.8
% of candidates passing baccalaureat (1967-8)	Ville	91.2	85.9
	Académie	90.6	
Mean scores in 3rd class--verbal apt.	Ville	34.06	30.75
--numerical apt.		18.49	18.21
--spatial		27.77	24.92
Science achievement means*		17.0	18.3
Retentivity			
% Scholarization in 1st cycle (pub. & pvt.)	Académie	75.3	72.4
% Scholarization at 2nd cycle (pub. & pvt.)	Académie	44.5	34.6
System Development			
% of all pupils in private ed. in all 1st cycle		15.4	20.0
Av. class size (primary)		29.0	26.3
% overcrowded classes (35 pupils or more, primary)		10.0	6.4
Ratio of primary pupils (Index 100) to pre-school Ville		52.8	38.8
to special ed.Ville		8.6	3.6

Sources

*IEA data

Ministère de l'Education Nationale, Service Central des Statistiques et Sondages, Indicateurs Relatifs aux Disparités Regionales 1968/69 en Matière d'Enseignement du Second Degré. Paris, 1971 (Doc. No. 3932).

Ministère de l'Education Nationale, Statistiques des Enseignements 1968-69. Paris, 1970. Vols. 2, No. 1; 4, 1; 6, 2.

Materials supplied by Mlle. Bacher, Institut National d'Etudes du Travail et d'Orientation Professionelle, and by officials of the central statistical services.

TABLE 4.1D

PATTERNS OF SCHOOL SUCCESS: INTRA-NATIONAL COMPARISONS

	N.Y.	U.S.
Pupil Achievement		
Performance on standardized achievement tests, expressed as grade equivalents: 4th grade reading	4.6	4.7
study skills	4.2	4.7
math skills	4.3	4.7
8th grade reading	7.8	8.5
study skills	7.9	8.5
math skills	7.3	8.5
% above grade norm in each of the above		
Science achievement means*	22.8	21.5
Reading comprehension means*	27.8	27.3
Literature means*	17.7	16.5
Retentivity		
H.S. graduates as % of 9th graders 4 yrs. previously	65	71.6
System Success		
% of all pupils in private schools	27.9	13.8
Teacher/pupil ratio (elem.)	23.4 or 28.0	24.8
Ratio of elem. pupils (Index 100) to pre-school pupils	19.6	9.2
to special ed.	17.4	7.3

Sources

*IEA Data.

New York State Division of the Budget, New York State Statistical Yearbook 1970. Albany, N.Y., 1970. Pp. 201-202, 204, 212.

United States Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States. Washington, D.C., 1970. Pp. 105, 113, 115, 122, 125.

New York Dept. of City Planning, Plan for 1969: A Proposal Vol. 1: Critical Issues. New York City, 1969. Pp. 99, 104.

New York City Public Schools, Facts and Figures 1969-70. New York, 1970. Pp. 58, 59, 61, 66, 75.

New York State Dept. of Education, Annual Education Summary, 1968-69. Albany, N.Y., 1969. P. 11.

Material provided by officials of New York Central Board of Education.

City School District of the City of New York, Summary of City-wide Reading Test Results for 1969-70. New York, 1970 (mimeo.) Pp. 2, 3, 13.

Board of Education of the City of New York, Analysis of City-Funded per Capita Costs and Staff Ratios for 1969-70. New York, (n.d., mimeo.). Pp. 1, 2.

Board of Education of the City of New York, Community District Profiles for 1969-70 School Year by Newly Aligned Community School Districts. New York, (mimeo). Pp. 1, 2.

TABLE 4.2

PATTERNS OF SCHOOL SUCCESS: COMPARATIVE INDEXES

	AMSTERDAM	LONDON	PARIS	NEW YORK
ACHIEVEMENT		Good readers 60 Poor 198 Destination of Leavers: Univ. B 100 G 67 Coll. of Ed. B 100 G 80 Other Ft. Ed. B 50 G 46	Graduating, 2nd cycle 116 Baccalaureat 106 105 3rd Class verbal apt. 111 numerical apt. 102 spatial 111	4th Grade Reading 98 Study skills 89 Math skills 91 8th Grade Reading 92 Study skills 93 Math skills 86
IEA Science Reading Comp. Literature	146 136 --	126 128 140	93 -- --	106 102 107
RETENTIVITY	15 yrs. in school 109 16 yrs. 111 17 yrs. 115	Leavers at 15 B 72 G 68 Stayers at 16 120 Stayers at 17 109	1st Cycle 104 2nd Cycle 129	H.S. Graduates 91
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	T/P Ratio 82	T/P Ratios: prim. 94 sec. 100	Av. class size 110 % overcrowded 151	T/P Ratio) 94 or (112
Pre-school/primary	85	148	(Ville de P.) 136 (Académie) 117	213
Special ed./prim.	129	293	(Ville de P.) 238 (Académie) 125	238
Rel. of private to public schooling	--	136	77	202

Note: See p. 19 above for details of the procedure used in constructing indexes.

Attention must now be given to the relative size of the private sectors of schooling in nation and city. In London and New York, metropolitan parents are considerably more likely to select an alternative to the public school system for their children than is the norm nationally, while in Paris the reverse is true. We cannot include Amsterdam in this comparison because the familiar distinctions between Church and State schooling simply do not obtain. Even for England, France, and the United States, policies and practices in this matter differ in each case. The distinctions, furthermore, may be denominational, or on the basis of social class, or a combination of both. However, if in these last three instances, private schooling is considered simply as the alternative to the public school system and as an option used by parents according to their degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the public schools, then we could assert that, on this measure, schools in Paris are more successful and those in New York and London less successful than their respective national counterparts in satisfying the preferences of parents.

Finally, in reviewing all the indicators of perceived success discussed here, and notwithstanding the mixed results, it is possible to discriminate among the four cities. Relative to their respective national norms, New York rates low on most measures, London high on some but low on others, Paris and, on the whole, Amsterdam, too, rate high. If we rank the four cities in descending order of perceived success of the school system relative to their national norms, then, the final order appears to be: 1. Paris; 2. Amsterdam; 3. London; 4. New York.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Relation of Metropolitan Teachers to School Success

What is peculiar to the metropolis and what distinguishes it from other types of human organization is its educational function. It is in this role that the metropolis appears to be unique: it is at once the progenitor, importer and exporter of culture, a powerful agency of education in its national and international contexts.

People, ideas, skills are attracted to the large city. In the metropolitan setting, their ideologies and technologies are generated, institutionalized and disseminated. The metropolis is itself the means for routing people and knowledge, defining and sorting them for the nation and for the world. The goods handled by this distribution system are ideas, skills and values; the operation is therefore centrally an educational one. What distinguishes the metropolis from other forms of large human settlement is that it is the school of nations.

Ideally, then, we would want to shed some direct light not only on the schools and other institutions of formal education, but also upon the educational roles and function of the entire metropolitan environment -- its streets, stores, jobs, museums, art galleries, presses and broadcasting studios. In this exploratory study we have been unable to do this, and we have instead concentrated on a number of selected aspects of the formal school system. Obviously there, too, we have only scratched the surface of the range of topics awaiting attention.

But within the limits adopted, we do appear to have generated considerable evidence to support one central and two subsidiary propositions. The first is that there are certain definable and measurable characteristics of teachers and schools in metropolitan areas that differentiate them systematically from their respective national norms. The secondary propositions are that (1) the metropolitan/national differences run in mostly the same direction in the four countries examined; (2) differences in degree of contrast (and sometimes in direction) can usually be ascribed without difficulty to certain identifiable characteristics of the national educational system.[1]

Specifically, we have found that in the four countries examined, the teacher cadre of the metropolis differs from that of the nation as a whole by containing a larger proportion of younger teachers and a smaller proportion of older teachers; by having higher educational and training qualifications on average and also a smaller proportion without full qualifications; and by being less professionally committed. In these respects our findings support our initially stated hypotheses. However, in one important respect our initial hypothesis is not confirmed: metropolitan teachers are not more likely to be male than teachers elsewhere in the nation. Only in New York City is this so. Moreover this result is found in spite of the fact that the school systems of the metropolises tend to contain a larger proportion of secondary school teachers (who tend to be male) and a smaller proportion of primary school teachers (who tend to be female). We find it difficult at this point to suggest why this is so.

With respect to the perceived success of the metropolitan school system, relative to that of the nation as a whole, once again our initial hypotheses are largely supported by our findings, though we would wish to emphasize that we are far removed indeed from providing firm confirmation. There is some weak evidence that school achievement levels in the metropolis are higher than elsewhere (except in New York) and that the distribution of metropolitan achievement scores perhaps tends to be bi-modal to a greater extent than in non-metropolitan areas. Certainly, the special facilities of metropolitan areas are greater, and the retentivity of their schools higher; but their teacher/pupil ratios are less favorable and parents in metropolises are more likely than other parents to select a non-public school alternative for their children.

Let us now attempt to associate the relative characteristics of metropolitan teachers with the relative perceived success of metropolitan school systems.

Table 5.1 ranges the four metropolises from left to right in descending order of relative perceived school success, based upon summary of the comparative indexes given in Table 4.2. That is, the Paris school system relative to France is first, because it is perceived to be more successful than any of the other three; New York's school system relative to the U.S. is perceived as being less successful than any of the other three, and is listed last. Amsterdam ranks

---

[1] See Appendix 3 for a theoretical discussion of this approach to comparative studies in education.

in second place, London in third.

In the body of the table the metropolises are ranked on 17 aspects of teacher characteristics. A high rank indicates a high value for the metropolis in question relative to its national norm, and not necessarily a high value in absolute terms (though this is not, of course, excluded). Thus, in the first line, the ranks indicate that New York has the highest proportion of young teachers relative to the U.S. norm, and Paris the smallest relative to the French norm.

Looking down the column for Paris, it is noteworthy that Paris, the city with the highest relative success ranking, has not only the smallest relative proportion of young teachers and the highest of older teachers, but also the lowest proportion lacking full qualifications, the highest with high qualifications, readership of journals about teaching and attendance at educational conferences. At the same time, Paris has the highest relative proportion with a degree and the lowest with over four years of full-time secondary education.

The composite picture that is thus conveyed is of a teaching force that, relative to France as a whole, is older, more female, more qualified by education and training, more stable and more professionally committed than are London's teachers relative to England and Wales, Amsterdam's relative to the Netherlands, and New York's relative to the U.S. Especially in the case of New York is there an impression of a relatively very young, male, highly unionized, professionally uncommitted and mobile teaching cadre, with education and training qualifications not too different from those of teachers in the U.S. as a whole.

Amsterdam also has a large number of extreme ranks, but no clear pattern of variables emerges. London, too, demonstrates no clear pattern, with few extreme ranks. None of the immediately preceding analysis is meant to imply that the relative superiority of Paris teachers' characteristics is causally related to the perceived success of the Paris school system. This can be by no means demonstrated with the evidence we supply. Instead, though, we would suggest an associative relationship: a teaching cadre in Paris that looks relatively "old-fashioned" is associated with a school system that is perceived to be relatively highly successful.

That this is so is probably due to antecedent factors common to both sets of observed phenomena: such factors as rates of demographic and social change, the pace of educational reform, system size, adequacy of financing metropolitan enterprises in general and education in particular, and the prestige attached to metropolitan institutions.

Data in any study of this kind are subject to at least two types of interpretation. The first, as we have just demonstrated, is concerned with relationships among factors, and when the data are reliable and the analyses rational, the range of debate over meaning may be quite limited. The second level of interpretation, however, is invariably more open and will inevitably suggest a far wider range of possible implications, for it is concerned with the policy implications: given the probably established facts and relationships, what is one to do?

Some Suggestions for Policy

In the absence of firm causal statements linking together the several aspects of the metropolitan environment, suggestions for policy must be advanced in an extremely tentative manner and with no pretence that they are necessitated by the findings presented earlier. At the same time, researchers should avoid the stance that their only task is to "find the facts" and that they can abandon wholly to others ("the policy makers") recommendations on policy.

With respect to policy for improving the perceived success of the New York City school system, the implied task for policy makers, in our view, is that they must educate themselves and their publics about the multi-faceted nature of success-criteria, and learn to abjure the assumption that its measurement is a simple task, or that there exists only one legitimate measure that can provide unambiguous ratings of school system success. In this study, we have used a number of indicators of perceived school success, but they by no means exhaust the possibilities.

We have been unable to include measures of economic success, reflecting the levels of pedagogical efficiency attained by each metropolitan school system (that is, how far has each system brought how many, on what range of skills and knowledge, and at what cost); and we have no direct measures of expressed student satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their schools. Policy-making needs to take these aspects of school success into account, too. Where the success criteria are complementary as, for example, when the achievement of higher levels of pedagogical efficiency releases resources for other purposes, the policy problems are mitigated. But where, as is so often the case, criteria of success are in conflict, the need to identify them clearly, measure them appropriately, and estimate the trade-off ratios between them is urgent. To do all these things requires more than merely reacting to the pressures of political and educational interest groups aimed at achieving acceptable compromises. But in doing them, we believe, educational policymakers will be exerting the responsible and creative leadership needed.

TABLE 5.1 RANKINGS OF METROPOLISES: CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS RELATIVE TO THEIR NATIONAL NORMS

	Rankings on Relative School Success			
	1st PARIS	2nd AMSTERDAM	3rd LONDON	4th N.Y.
I. AGE. Relative proportion of young teachers	4	2	3	1
" " " older "	1	4	3	2
II. SEX. Proportion female	3	1	2	4
III. QUALIFICATIONS. Proportion lacking full qualifications	3	-	1	2
Proportion w/o degree	1	3	2	-
Proportion with high qualifications	1	-	3	2
Proportion with over 4 years of full-time post-secondary education	4	1	2	3
IV. EXPERIENCE. Proportion with 5 years or less teaching exp.	4	1	3	2
V. PROFESSIONALISM. Membership of general teaching association	2	4	3	1
" " " subject matter "	3	1	4	2
Less than 3 hrs. per week for preparation	2	4	3	1
" " " " " " " grading	-	3	1	2
Regular reading of journals about teaching	1	=2	=2	=2
" " " " " " subject	=2	1	=2	=2
Attendance at educ. conferences in past yr.	1	3	2	4
Teachers teaching full-time	2	4	3	1
VI. TURNOVER. Proportion with 5 years or less in current school	3	4	2	1

Source: Tables 2.2 and 4.2, supra.

One conclusion of all the recent important research on the correlates of school success is that the characteristics of teachers, as measured, explain only a small proportion of the achievement variance.[2] However, when we widen the criteria of success somewhat, as we have done in this study, and undertake the investigation on a cross-metropolitan basis, we observe that some teacher characteristics are correlated with perceived relative school success. Even though we cannot show any causal connection, the implication is that it may be worth while thinking about how New York City might improve overall the relative experience, skill, professional stability and commitment of its teaching force. This is not to argue that we should try to turn New York City into Paris, even if we could, but to encourage a very careful look at some foreign models of teacher recruitment, conditions of service, and training that may have interest potential: for example, the Teachers Centres of England and the use of demonstration school projects for in-service training of young teachers in Amsterdam.

An informed view of how other important metropolitan areas are (or are not) succeeding in managing these matters is indispensable. Metropolitan policymakers are not served well if scholars allow them to act on the assumption that only in New York City, or indeed only in the United States, are all the problems of metropolitan education immensely difficult. Indeed, it is essential for good city administration that mayors, councilmen and superintendents of schools be able to say: "Yes, we do have these and these educational problems. Some of these problems are very much our own, and our own peculiar circumstances must be tackled pragmatically and creatively, for there is little to learn from others. But there are other identifiable problems that we share with most metropolises abroad, and we may be able to learn about potential solutions from others' experience."

In the larger perspective of policy, and because we believe that there are some common antecedent factors lying beyond both relative teacher characteristics and relative perceived school success, we would urge school policy to address itself as much, if not more, to matters outside the school system as to those within it. How to alter the pace and pattern of metropolitan migration; how to raise the prestige and financial viability of metropolitan institutions, in general; how to grapple with the problems raised by the sheer size of the metropolis. These are some of the really important issues, and solutions to them, particularly to the problems of migration, will go far to solve the problems of metropolitan schools. These solutions cannot be found by educational policy makers alone; they cannot be found within the confines of fixed and non-functional boundaries of local administration; and they cannot rely on restrictions imposed on specified economic or ethnic groups. Instead, the work must be done collaboratively with other city planners and policymakers; it must embrace a metropolitan unit that makes functional sense and is not restricted by obsolete administrative boundaries; and it must be cast in positive terms using incentives to balance controls.

---

[2]See, inter alia, J. S. Coleman, et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

APPENDIX 1

METROPOLITAN STATISTICS

A. Demography, Communications, Culture*

	Amsterdam	Greater London	Paris Agglom.	Paris	New York
POPULATION[a]					
Male	419,234	3,764,000	-	-	-
Female	442,794	4,116,800	-	-	-
Total	862,026	7,880,800	6,425,522[b]	2,590,771[b]	11,555,000
BIRTHS[a]					
Male	6,125	68,739	52,771	20,317	-
Female	5,924	65,596	49,685	19,035	-
Total	12,049	134,337	102,456	39,352	193,817
per 1000 inhabs.	14.0	17.0	15.9	15.0	16.8
DEATHS[a]					
Male	4,767	43,032	31,419	14,512	-
Female	3,738	42,255	30,842	14,883	-
Total	8,505	85,267	62,261	29,397	118,938
per 1000 inhabs.	9.9	10.8	9.7	11.2	10.3
EXCESS OF BIRTHS OVER DEATHS					
Absolute	3,544	49,050	40,195	9,955	74,879
per 1000	4.1	6.2	6.2	3.8	6.5
NEW HOUSING[a]					
Newly constructed conventional dwellings--Total	3,905	32,541	49,255	10,722	48,544
per 1000 inhabs.	4.5	4.1	7.7	4.1	4.2
CIVIL AIRPORT[c, b] TRAFFIC					
Passengers[d] embarked	1,742	6,583	4,153		9,664
Passengers disembarked	1,764	6,576	4,085		9,909
Passengers in direct transit	82	196	333		-
Freight loaded[e]	61,721	162,881	94,828		303,716
unloaded	60,392	128,600	78,042		294,445
Mail loaded[e]	3,346	16,389	17,845		73,852
unloaded	3,176	12,768	14,264		52,457

*Source: International Statistical Institute, International Statistical Yearbook of Large Towns. Vol. 4, 1968 (ISI, The Hague, 1970).

Definitions of Towns

Amsterdam = The administrative town.

Greater London Conurbation = London, Middlesex, parts of Essex, Herts, Kent, Surrey (thus including County and Municipal Boroughs and Urban Districts).

Paris Agglom. = Ville de Paris and the départements of Hauts-de-Seine, Seine-Saint-Denis, Val-de-Marne (i.e. Paris plus 123 communes, and not the official definition of the Paris agglom. determined in 1968, which comprises Paris plus 278 communes).

New York = SMSA; that is, New York City Boroughs, and portions of Nassau and Westchester Counties.

APPENDIX 1 (Continued)

	Amsterdam	Greater London	Paris Agglom.	Paris	New York
URBAN TRANSPORTATION[a]					
Length of lines in km.					
Tram	88.2		-		
Bus	229.9	5,200	1,313		
Urban Rlwy.	-	344	204.7		
MASS MEDIA[a]					
Telephones per 1000	362	210		605	
(or #)	310,852[f]	1,972,800[f]		1,566,441[f]	5,534,008[i], j
Radios per 1000	-	62			11,884,500[i], j
(or #)	-	579,400[g]			
TV per 1000	334	303		237[h]	
(or #)	201,494[g]	2,851,100[g]		614,000[g,h]	2,971,125[i], j
THEATRES[a]					
#	5	54	73	63	1,602[l]
# of seats	4,260	59,396	50,783	44,141	
seats per 1000 inh.	5.0	7.5	7.9	17.0	
LIBRARIES[a]					
# National, State, Univ.	5	90[b]		15	43
# of vols. stocked[k]	2.9	5.8[b]		10.5	8,523
# of vols. borrowed[k]	0.16			1.7	
Public libraries					
#		416[b]	158	78	3[m]
vols. stocked[k]	0.84[c]	14.3[b]		1.15	8.023
vols. borrowed[k]	3.2	89.3[b]	5.86	3.14	
borrowed per 1000 inhabs.	3,738	11,329[b]	913	1,127	

Footnotes:

[a]Figs. for 1967.

[b]Figs. for 1968

[c]Airports: New York=Kennedy; Paris=2 airports; London=Heathrow.

[d]Passengers in '000.

[e]Freight and mail in tons.

[f]Instruments in use.

[g]Licences issued.

[h]TV and radio combined.

[i]Estimated.

[j]Figs. for 1969.

[k]Figs. in millions.

[l]Includes cinemas.

[m]Main administrative units only. Total number of branch libraries in New York City is 188.

APPENDIX 1

METROPOLITAN STATISTICS

B. School Systems

		Amsterdam[1] 1968/9	London (ILEA)[2] 1968/9	Paris[3] 1968/9	New York[4] 1969/70
No. of Schools					
Pre-school	O.	93			
	D.	105			
	T.	198	28	200	n.a.
Primary	O.	146			
	D.	158			
	T.	304	884	427	771
Secondary	O.	29			
	D.	62			
	T.	91	223	335	90
Special	O.	29			
	D.	20			
	T.	49	100	45	45
No. of Teachers					
Pre-school	O.	428			
	D.	425			
	T.	853		1,674	n.a.
Primary	O.	1,462			
	D.	1,489			
	T.	2,951	19,390	5,034	46,263
Secondary	O.				
	D.				
	T.	2,453		8,510	14,313
Special	O.	258			
	D.	144			
	T.	402	947	306	2,315
No. of Pupils					
Pre-school	O.	13,654			
	D.	12,215			
	T.	25,869	2,803	61,157	100,198
Primary	O.	37,125			
	D.	33,108			
	T.	70,233	247,211	115,708	704,250
Secondary	O.	13,419			
	D.	19,458			
	T.	32,877	163,954	131,456	318,638
Special	O.	3,475			
	D.	1,882			
	T.	5,357	9,586	10,073	7,728

Notes to Appendix 1 B. School Systems

1. For Amsterdam, figures are given separately for open (i.e. public, secular) schooling - O; for denominational (and other non-public) schooling - D; and the totals of O and D combined.- T.

   Source: Bureau van Statistiek der Gemeente Amsterdam, Statistiek van het Ondewijs te Amsterdam (1968/'69, deel I). Amsterdam, 1970; and Jaarboek 1970.

2. For London, figures are for all maintained county and voluntary school and, thus, include certain denominational and other schools receiving public funds. Of the total number of teachers cited, about 54 per cent were in secondary schools.

   Source: Greater London Council, 1968: Annual Abstract of Greater London Statistics. Vol. 3. London, 1979.

3. For Paris, figures refer to the Ville de Paris and not for the whole département or académie, public schools only.

   Source: Ministère de l'Education Nationale, Statistiques des Enseignements, 1968/69) Vols. 2, 1; 2, 2; 3, 1; 4, 1. Paris, 1969.

4. For New York City, figures refer to public schooling only. Pre-school includes nursery schools and kindergardens; primary includes grades 1-8; secondary includes grades 9-12. Number of teachers excludes principals, department chairmen and other personnel in administrative and supervisory positions.

   Source: New York City Public Schools, Facts and Figures 1969-1970. New York, 1970.

APPENDIX 2

A. Teacher Characteristics

VARIABLES	INDICATORS
Natural	Age Sex
Social	
Social Origin	Father's occupation Father's education
Social Status	Social origin of spouse Ownership of home Ownership of car Possession of telephone
Economic Status	Annual salary Supplementary earnings Teachers as % of labour force
Educational	
Level of general Education	No. of years of post-secondary education (full-time) % holding university degree
Level of Professional Edn.	% holding professional qualification % enrolled in in-service training
Professional	
Commitment to Profession	% leaving teaching p.a. % membership in teacher organizations % active in teacher organizations
Quality of Teacher Cadre	% with less than 3 yrs. teaching experience % involved in innovative school programs % lacking full qualification for post occupied % of part-time teachers % teaching levels or subjects for which they are not trained
Other	
Civic Involvement	Frequency of membership in non-teacher organizations % travelling abroad during previous year
Cultural Activities	No. of professional journals taken No. of non-professional journals taken No. of concerts, theatre performances attended

B. School Success Characteristics

VARIABLES	INDICATORS
Academic Success	Enrollment rates in non-compulsory education Average class size Achievement levels in standard tests Success rates in public examinations Teacher-pupil ratios at specified levels
System Effectiveness	Ratio of pre-school and special education enrollments to primary school enrollments No. of school closures due to pupil, teacher or per cent action Per capita pupil expenditures Ratio of classroom teachers to other educational employees % of school building in inadequate condition % of school building overutilized
Public Support of System	Volume, Targets, Sources } of criticism of school system Amount of financial support Extent of objections to increasing financial support

APPENDIX 3

DEFINING COMPARATIVE EDUCATION*

The last decade has witnessed not only a vast burgeoning of the literature in and about comparative education, but also a radical change in the rationales, methods, and goals of the field. Imagine the situation of R. V. Winkle, a professor of comparative education, who had fallen asleep at the end of 1959, to awaken again only in 1970. His slumbers would have commenced with his subject dominated by the works of Kandel, Hans, Lauwerys, and Rossello. He would have been aware of only the barest intimations of a more deliberately social-scientific approach. On awakening he would have found a new style of work bidding strongly to take over the field, though without having won over by any means all of its practitioners. In any event, he would have had a formidable reading assignment awaiting his attention!

Much of the justification for doing comparative education prior to 1960 was in terms of its potentialities either for countering parochialism or ethnocentrism, or for assisting in the improvement of education at home. Basically, researchers and writers were asking such questions as: "What is characteristically French about the French secondary school curriculum?" or, "What is happening in German schools that we might profit from?" The theme of recent work may perhaps be seen as a progressive transfer of attention from country characteristics to problems, and from problems to the specification of relationships and the formulation and testing of theories. This is not to suggest, of course, that the new style has found universal and unquestioned acceptance, or that the previous genre of work is without merit. On the contrary, we continue to see, and shall continue to want, studies with such titles as, "Higher Education Reform in Germany," "The Technical School in the Dominican Republic," "Local Initiatives in Pre-School Education in the Soviet Union," and so on. Moreover, all is not plain sailing in the new mode. The conceptual and practical problems of conducting theory-oriented comparative research are not only not immediately and obviously tractable, but are also being widely aired.[1]

In this change of emphasis comparative education is clearly following a course already charted in economics, sociology and political science. Economics has ventured furthest, perhaps. It has now left far behind its earlier preoccupation with the identification and description of economic institutions and has become a complex endeavor to explain and predict behavior connected with making choices among alternatives. Sociology, similarly, has moved beyond the description and classification of social units to analysis and prediction of their interaction. And, just at the present time, some of the most fruitful work of relevance for comparative education is currently appearing from political scientists pursuing a cross-national approach.[2]

Clearly, these parallel developments have not occurred simply by chance: they express a common reaction to a common set of methodological potentialities and problems. The challenge to move from the particular to the generalizable, from identification-description-classification to hypothesis-testing, theory building and prediction is pervasive.

One test of the progress of a science is its acquisition of a terminology. In developing "technical terms," words are often borrowed from everyday use, and then more precisely defined for technical purposes. One thinks immediately of the use in physics of the term "velocity" (with its essential connotation of direction) as distinct from the unvectored concept, "speed"; or, in economics our attempt to define "demand" as "ability and willingness to pay," and not simply to retain its common meaning of "need" or "desire." Indeed, on occasion the most far-reaching result of scientific study of a phenomenon appears to be the recognition of a new, more powerful, albeit more limited, definition of a term.

Consider what is happening to the term "comparative" in the title that denotes our field. I believe that we are about to move rather rapidly away from the everyday meaning of the word to a much more technical meaning. This rather radical redefinition of the term "comparative education," will involve at once a limitation and an extension of its scope. The impulse toward limitation will arise because we have come to realize that many studies that happen to use international and foreign data are not to be considered "comparative" simply by virtue of that fact; and the impulse toward extension will occur because many studies conducted on the basis of data drawn from within a single country nevertheless have a valid claim to be considered comparitive, once we define the term in a way that reflects the function of comparison in systematic explanation. Clearly, while this process is continuing we can expect a rather lively controversy on just what the term should and does mean.

---

*Revised version of paper presented by Harold J. Noah to Conference of Experts in Methodology of Comparative Education, UNESCO Institute for Education, Hamburg, F.R.G., August 1971.

Comparative education has mistakenly come to be identified either with the study of education in another country, or with studies using data drawn from more than one country. This view of what constitutes comparative education enjoys the sanction of both common usage and common sense. One finds out what is going on abroad and compares it with what is happening at home, often with a practical program of amelioration in view.[3] Certainly, many essays in comparative education are of this type. Alternatively, one uses a collection of multi-national data to identify, describe, and compare relationships (usually correlations) within education, or between education and other social phenomena.[4] Again, I must emphasize that to call such studies "comparative" agrees with common sense and usage. But the weakness of that position is that it establishes as the criterion for classification as a comparative study the mere presence or absence of foreign or multi-national characteristics of data, and by implication ignores, or even denies, the existence of a characteristically comparative method. We are hindered from asking a set of key questions: Are all inter-, cross-, or multi-national studies ipso facto comparative? Are all comparative studies necessarily either inter-, cross-, or multi-national? What indeed, are the necessary and sufficient conditions for a study to be comparative? Does there exist a characteristic comparative approach to a problem? If so, what is it?

Nations constitute one important set of systems that attract our attention, and we have employed so-called comparative studies largely to identify and describe the attributes of such national systems. We have ended up with "nominal" statements of the type: "In country A, the secondary school curriculum is thus-and-such; while in country B, it is so-and-so; and in countries C, D, and E, it is something else." Or, we might say in quantitative terms: "In country A, the fraction of the GNP spent on education is high (7-8%); in country B, it is moderate (5%); in country C, it is low (2½-3%)."

However, as the social sciences have extended the range of questions they ask, and as comparative studies (among them, comparative education) have matured, so we have begun to comprehend a fundamentally different role for comparison, whether conducted on the basis of national systems, or of other units. The key to this transformation in our thought lies in the attempt inherent in the social sciences to explain and predict, rather than merely to identify and describe. A simplified example may, perhaps, help illustrate the new emphasis in comparative work.

Let us assume that we wish to explain (and, perhaps predict) the relationship between the geographical location (metropolitan, urban, suburban, rural) of families and the probability of the children of these families enrolling in full-time third-level education. If we find (mirabile dictu) that this relationship is the same from country to country, then we have no need to proceed further. We can immediately make a general (that is, a non system-specific) statement defining a relationship between family location and the probability of third-level enrollment that is valid without including the names of any countries. But matters are more complicated if we are faced with the more likely case in which relationships differ from country to country. For example, we might find that while all countries exhibit a positive relationship between metropolitan location and enrollment in third-level education, the correlation is very strong in some countries, only moderate in others, and rather weak in a third group. Or, putting it in the language of least-squares linear regression analysis, we find that our best fitting equation explains different proportions of the observed variance in different countries. Let us assume, too, that no amount of within-systems adjustment of either the independent or dependent variables alters the fundamental fact that in different countries family location in a metropolitan area is associated with (or, "produces") different probabilities of a family's children attending third-level institutions.

This is the paradigm situation calling for employment of the comparative method. We now have to ask, what are the system-level factors that are at work, influencing the interaction of within-system variables? As we shift the level of analysis from consideration of within-system to system level factors, we are engaged in trying out the effect upon these different within-system relationships of introducing additional, theoretically justifiable independent variables, in the form of system characteristics. We continue to do this until we can no longer a) increase further the proportion of observed variance explained within each country; and b) reduce further the differences among countries in the proportions of observed variance explained.

To continue with our example, we might try out in turn the effect of including among our explanatory variables such system level factors as "proportion of total population concentrated in the metropolis," "percentage of all jobs requiring university training that are located in the metropolis," "ratio of average metropolitan family size to average rural family size," and we stop when the inclusion of further theoretically justifiable system variables yields insignificant returns in terms of a) and b) above.[5]

Only at this point do we introduce the names of countries in explanation, ascribing the remaining differences in proportions of variance explained to the presently unanalyzed or unanalyzable peculiarities of the countries. In this explanatory model, country-names are used to tag bundles of unexplained variance. The object of the exercise, then, is not, as in traditional comparative studies, to extend and enrich as far as possible, the connotational content of country-names; instead, we seek to extend and enrich to the limit general "law-like," cross-system statements, bringing in country (that is, system) names only when our power accurately to generalize across countries fails. A comparative study is essentially an attempt as far as possible to replace the names of systems (countries) by the names of concepts (variables).

In this style of comparative study, for the example we have taken, we might hope to make a statement of the type:

> "In all countries, metropolitan location of families is positively associated with probability of children being enrolled in full-time third-level schooling, and metropolitan location explains at least one-half of within-country differences in the probability of enrollment. In those countries where the proportion of total population concentrated in the metropolis is high, and/or where a high percentage of all jobs requiring university training is concentrated in the metropolis, the explanatory power of metropolitan location rises in some cases to as much as three-quarters. Consideration of average metropolitan family sizes relative to family sizes in other geographical units (smaller towns, rural areas) does not improve explanation appreciably in any country."

For our present purpose, the crux of all this is the necessity at some point in the analysis to stop further within-country analysis and to change the level of analysis to incorporate among-country variables. For this is the essential condition for a study to be classified as "comparative": data is collected at more than one level and analysis also proceeds at more than one level. With this criterion we can attempt answers to the questions posed above.

Q. Does there exist a characteristic comparative approach to solving a problem, testing an hypothesis, formulating a theory? A. Yes. Q. Well then, what is it? A. It involves formulating the analysis so that within-system relations are explained as fully as possible using within-system variables; comparing the characteristics and differences of such explanations across systems; and trying to explain these characteristics and differences by changing the level of analysis to take account at the operation of variables identified at the level of systems.

Q. Are all comparative studies necessarily either inter-, cross-, or multi-national? A. No, although many are. National units commonly form the matrix for data collection and governments are willing to finance studies (either directly, or indirectly through the international agencies) as part of the international sport of competitive growthmanship. But we ought to insist that a study within, say, the United States of the relationship between family income and the probability of the family's children enrolling in third-level education, formulated in terms of South vs. non-South, or urban vs. rural areas, or whites vs. blacks, has an equal chance with an international study of employing the comparative approach, as defined above.[6]

Q. Are all inter-, cross-, or multi-national studies ipso facto comparative: A. No. Many studies use data from more than one country, but restrict the variables considered or the analysis employed to a single level, either within-system or whole-system, but not both. Thus, we have seen multi-national analyses of trends in educational expenditures that are restricted to juxtaposing country-level relationships (for example, percentage of Gross National Product devoted to education), and there are multi-country studies of curriculum restricted to within-country univariates (for example, the amounts of time assigned to different school subjects). In the technical sense of the term that we have suggested above, such studies are not comparative.[7]

Notes

1. See Bruce M. Russett, et al.; World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964, "Part B: The Analysis of Trends and Patterns," especially pp. 311-321, "Multifactor Explanations of Social Change"; also R. Merritt and S. Rokkan, eds., Comparing Nations: The Uses of Quantitative Data in Cross-National Research. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966; Bernhard Dieckmann, Zur Strategie des systematischen internationalen Vergleichs: Probleme des Datenbasis und der Entwicklungsbegriffe, and Dieter Berstecher, Zur Theorie und Technik des internationalen Vergleichs: Das Beispiel der Bildungsforschung, both volumes published in Stuttgart by Ernst Klett Verlag, 1970; also the papers by Andre J. F. Kobben, "The logic of cross-cultural analysis: why exceptions?"; Daniel Lerner, "Comparative analysis of processes of modernization"; Lee Benson, "The empirical and statistical basis for comparative analyses of historical change"; Goran Ohlin, "Aggregate comparisons: problems and prospects of quantitative analysis based on national accounts"; Hayward R. Alker, Jr., "Research possibilities using aggregate political and social data"; Erwin K. Scheuch, "The cross-cultural use of sample surveys: problems of comparability," all printed in S. Rokkan, ed., Comparative Research Across Cultures and Nations. Paris-The Hague: Mouton, 1968. The most recent work focussing on the questions of method is Adam Przeworski and Henry Teune, The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970. Some points presented below rely heavily upon Part One of this book. Each of the volumes cited above contains important bibliographies.

2. Przeworski and Teune, op. cit.; David E. Apter, Some Conceptual Approaches to the Study of Modernization. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968; R. C. Macridis, The Comparative Study of Politics. New York: Random House, 1968; H. A. Scarrow, Comparative Political Analysis. New York: Harper and Row, 1969; and Paul Shoup, "Comparing Communist Nations: Prospects for An Empirical Approach," American Political Science Review, Vol. 62, 1968. G. A. Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963 remains a work of primary importance in the field of comparative political/educational analysis, although see Scheuch's contribution in Rokkan, op. cit., for a critique of many aspects of the Almond and Verba work.

3. The locum classicus is M. A. Jullien's, "Esquisse . . ." See S. Fraser, Jullien's Plan for Comparative Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

4. See, for example, Michel Debeauvais, "Comparative Study of Educational Expenditure and Its Trends in OECD Countries Since 1950." Paper prepared for the Conference on Policies for Educational Growth, OECD, 1970.

5. Often, of course, we must stop short of this point, owing to lack of time and money.

6. Such a statement might set the stage for trying to develop a cross-nationally valid theory of the link between family income and family demand for schooling in general, and not just for third-level education.

7. Most of us attending this conference are specifically concerned with the comparative study of educational phenomena based on national units. Perhaps, therefore, our field might be better termed: "cross-national comparative education". This nomenclature would have the merit of implying the existence of other bases or units for undertaking comparative analysis. Not only would we want to retain links with comparative studies using other bases, but we would recognize the existence of a common logic underlying all comparative analysis, and be drawn to follow it in our work.